DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 426 512 EA 029 625

AUTHOR Anderson, Leslie M.; Turnbull, Brenda J.
TITLE Living in Interesting Times: Early State Implementation of New Federal Education Laws.
INSTITUTION Policy Studies Associates, Inc., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC. Planning and Evaluation Service.
PUB DATE 1998-10-00
NOTE 151p.
CONTRACT EA94053001
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Administration; *Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Finance Reform; Financial Problems; *Program Administration; State Regulation
IDENTIFIERS *Goals 2000

ABSTRACT

This report provides baseline information on the early implementation of Goals 2000 and programs reauthorized under Improving America's Schools Act (IASA), analyzing the ways in which state officials who administer finances have responded to the new legislative mandates. The study intended not only to gather information more efficiently through cross-cutting data collection, but also to examine how each program related to the overall reform agenda in the states. The focus is on changes in program administration 2 years after the 1994 enactment of these programs, asking such questions as how state program managers were implementing the laws' provisions and how implementation had changed when compared with state practices under the predecessor programs. Findings show that state administrators offered a mixed assessment of the extent to which their own flexibility had increased in the first 2 years. All administrators made noticeable changes to their procedures in implementing the reauthorized program, but most program administrators gave little evidence that they were monitoring student performance. Compliance monitoring was being replaced with technical assistance--primarily offered to districts that knew when and how to ask for it. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EA

ED 426 512

Living in Interesting Times: Early State Implementation of New Federal Education Laws

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Prepared Under Contract by:

Policy Studies Associates
Washington, DC
1998

Contract No. EA94053001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION · OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY

EA029625

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education

Richard W. Riley
Secretary

Marshall S. Smith
Deputy Secretary (Acting)

Alan L. Ginsburg
Director, Planning and Evaluation Service

Valena W. Plisko
Director, Elementary and Secondary Education Division
Planning and Evaluation Service

Joanne Bogart
Elementary and Secondary Education Division
Planning and Evaluation Service

Living in Interesting Times: Early State Implementation of New Federal Education Laws

Leslie M. Anderson
Brenda J. Turnbull

October 1998

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Education
Office of the Under Secretary
Planning and Evaluation Service

Prepared by:

Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
Washington, DC

This report was supported by the U.S. Department of Education under Contract EA94053001. Opinions expressed are those of the authors. No endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	i
I. Introduction	1
The Nine Federal Programs Studied	2
Study Purposes and Research Questions	4
Study Methods	5
Survey Respondents	6
II. Flexibility: Do States and Districts Experience New Latitude in Meeting the Laws' Challenges?	9
States' Administrative Flexibility	9
Local Administrative Flexibility	22
Waivers of Statutory or Regulatory Requirements	30
Summary: The Status of "Flexibility"	34
III. Accountability: To What Extent Are States Using Performance Data to Inform Their Efforts?	37
Accountability as a Force Shaping Federal Program Services	37
Uses of Data in SEA Program Management	39
Monitoring	46
Summary: Accountability Mechanisms in Place	55
IV. Technical Assistance and Professional Development: Are States Working Strategically to Build Capacity?	57
Technical Assistance	57
Professional Development	62
Summary: More Focus on Process than on Content	69
V. Conclusions	71
Appendix: Survey Instruments	

Executive Summary

Study Purposes and Design

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA), which amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, were enacted in 1994. They promote the flexible use of federal funds to support systemic, standards-based approaches to improving teaching and learning. State education agencies (SEAs) play a crucial role in implementing these laws: they are a primary source of information and guidance for local school districts; and the states have the lead role in setting academic standards and deciding how to assess student progress.

This study provided baseline information on the early implementation of Goals 2000 and programs reauthorized under IASA and analyzed the ways in which the state officials who administer each of several federally funded programs have responded to the new legislative mandates. Because the reauthorization period for Goals 2000 and programs reauthorized under IASA extends through the year 1998-1999, a follow-up implementation study is scheduled for late summer and early fall 1998. The Follow-up Study of State Implementation of Federal Elementary and Secondary Programs will analyze the ways in which administrators of federally funded programs have continued to respond to the new legislative framework. Both the baseline and follow-up implementation studies will inform congressionally mandated evaluations of the impact of federal education programs.

The programs included in the baseline study were: Goals 2000: Educate America Act; Title I-A: Improving Basic Programs Implemented by Local Educational Agencies; Title I-B: Even Start Family Literacy; Title I-C: Education of Migratory Children; Title I-D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk of Dropping Out; Title II: Eisenhower Professional Development Program; Title IV: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities; Title VI: Innovative Education Program Strategies; and Subtitle VII-B of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youth. The study intended to not only gather information more efficiently through cross-cutting data collection, but also to examine how each program related to the overall reform agenda in the states.

- This study focused on changes in program administration two years after the 1994 enactment of Goals 2000, ESEA, and the McKinney Act, and one year into full program implementation. Specifically, the study asked: (1) how state program managers were implementing the laws' provisions; (2) how implementation had changed when compared with state practices under the predecessor programs; and (3) what federal and state factors had influenced these changes. The study explored the extent to which managers administered

federal programs in ways that: (1) made use of increased flexibility across programs; (2) made programs more accountable for student performance; and (3) supported improvements in teaching and learning.

- Surveys were administered during late fall 1996 and early winter 1997 in all 51 state education agencies (including the District of Columbia) to managers of each of the nine federal programs plus state research or evaluation specialists knowledgeable about assessment in the Title I program. The surveys were conducted as in-person interviews in 14 states and telephone interviews for the remaining 37 states. Out of a possible 510 surveys, 485 were completed, a response rate of 95 percent.

Flexibility: Do States and Districts Experience New Latitude in Meeting the Laws' Challenges?

State administrators of federal elementary and secondary programs offered a mixed assessment of the extent to which their own flexibility, or that of local districts, had increased in the first two years after reauthorization. This study investigated their experience with provisions that promoted cross-program planning, permitted consolidation of administrative funds, and encouraged waivers of provisions that might impede local flexibility.

States' Administrative Flexibility

Although most state administrators reported taking advantage of at least some of the provisions that were expected to add new flexibility (e.g., authorization of consolidated local applications), fewer than half believed the legislation increased their flexibility in carrying out their program responsibilities. However, some explained that their programs had always offered flexibility.

- Title I was the only program in which most administrators reported increased flexibility at the state level: 32 of them reported an increase, and 17 of these characterized the increase as "considerable." Many of the non-Title I administrators--especially in Title VI, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities-- argued that their programs had always offered flexibility.

- Program managers pointed to three major themes if they described newfound administrative flexibility: (1) opportunity to coordinate and collaborate with other federally funded programs; (2) opportunity to approve a wider range of local program designs; and (3) pooling of state staff and other resources.

- The more areas of administration to which programs reported making changes since the reauthorization (i.e., in procedures for local applications, monitoring, professional

development, or technical assistance), the more likely they were to report finding that the legislation gave them more administrative flexibility.

State consolidated planning. All but one state submitted a consolidated plan to ED, and most administrators reported that the process was both inclusive and worthwhile.

- Collectively, almost all administrators of the nine programs in this study (92 percent) participated in the development of their state's consolidated plan in 1996. Most were quite enthusiastic about the consolidated planning process and the extent to which this process helped inform them--in many cases for the first time--about the activities of other state program administrators and about ways federally funded programs could work together.

- Many state administrators' comments reflected a preliminary stage of collaborating. Program administrators were still learning how to communicate with each other. It was not clear, based on administrators' comments, how consolidated planning was translating into coordinated program services and operations; many administrators seemed to be just planning for planning's sake.

- Although most respondents applauded the opportunity to do consolidated planning, administrators of the smaller discretionary grants programs--Migrant Education, Even Start, and Education for Homeless Children and Youth--expressed concern about the risk of overlooking the needs of special populations.

Consolidated administrative funding. ESEA allows states to consolidate into a single pool the administrative set-asides under Title I, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Goals 2000, Eisenhower Professional Development, Title VI, Migrant Education, Neglected or Delinquent, and Even Start. Very few respondents described consolidation of administrative funding as making it "easier to plan across programs," as encouraged in ED's cross-cutting guidance.

- In just nine states did administrators of the eligible programs report an across-the-board consolidation of state administrative funds. Of these nine, there were just two states in which administrators tended to report that consolidation had affected their own work "to a considerable extent," and many of them perceived the effects as negative (e.g., more steps needed in coordination). Both of these SEAs had moved toward not just consolidated state planning but also consolidated application workshops and monitoring for local districts.

- Looking at all the administrators across all states who believed their agency had consolidated administrative funds, 55 percent reported at least some effect on their own work. Often, they cited the lifting of a requirement to keep "time and effort" logs for tracking administrative funds to individual programs; some said that this helped them work more effectively or efficiently.

Local Administrative Flexibility

Compared with the percentage of state administrators who believed the legislation had brought them more flexibility, a higher percentage believed the legislation had brought more flexibility to local school districts, other subgrantees, and schools. Nevertheless, state administrators reported that many local program administrators were still working within the boundaries of their categorical programs and resisted efforts to coordinate program services and activities.

- When describing how the reauthorization had increased local flexibility, state administrators most commonly pointed to: (1) flexibility in the use of resources, staffing, and time; (2) opportunities to coordinate and collaborate with other programs; (3) increased availability of the option of schoolwide programs; and (4) devolution of decisionmaking authority from districts to schools.

- Administrators said much more about the processes of cross-program communication and coordination at the local level than about the purposes, such as ensuring that all children meet challenging standards.

Waivers of Statutory or Regulatory Requirements

The federal policy behind Goals 2000 and IASA amendments held that program requirements should not stand in the way of effective educational services. If a legal provision might prevent a district or school from using federal program funds to carry out its vision of reform, ED wanted the district to ask for a waiver of that provision. Survey data showed, however, that with the exception of Title I Directors, few state program managers promoted the waiver option among local districts and that these administrators expected the next year's waiver requests to number only in the hundreds.

- Title I administrators were the most active in their communications with school districts about waivers. Indeed, Title I was the only program with a majority of administrators who not only did the fairly simple administrative tasks such as forwarding copies of ED's waiver guidance but also provided technical assistance to districts in the process of preparing waiver requests.

- Most states were taking other steps toward removing barriers to local flexibility, such as reviewing their own laws or regulations that might impede local reform. The great majority of Goals 2000 administrators (38 out of 44) reported that their states were reviewing state laws and regulations. However, these efforts often lacked visibility among the administrators of other federal programs: only 41 percent of administrators of ESEA and homeless programs said they knew their state was planning to conduct such a review.

Accountability

This study explored the extent to which state administrators were using a variety of accountability tools--including student performance data as measured by state assessments, program performance indicators, and program monitoring systems--to press for improving student performance. With the exception of following some mandated procedures, such as identifying Title I schools in need of improvement, most program administrators gave only limited evidence that they were attending to student performance.

Uses of Data in SEA Program Management

With the exception of Title I directors, less than 20 percent of survey respondents said they used student performance data in ways that might help focus attention on student performance and thereby improve program quality, such as sending student performance reports to districts (19 percent) or to technical assistance providers (17 percent).[1]

- Almost all federal program administrators, 91 percent, said they received (or expected to receive soon) data on student performance. Some (15 percent) acknowledged that they did not use the data for any purpose. This was most common among administrators of Title VI and Eisenhower Professional Development--programs in which students are seldom direct participants.

- Program performance indicators were not a particularly common means by which program administrators assessed and improved program success. They were found in slight majorities of the state offices administering Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities and Even Start, but in only about one-fifth of the offices administering Title VI and Neglected or Delinquent. In most of the other programs, about 40 percent of managers said their offices had developed program performance indicators.

- Despite their infrequent use, program performance indicators seemed to hold value among those program administrators who did report using them.

---

[1] The percentages were higher for Title I directors: 36 percent reported sending performance reports to districts and 40 percent reported sending performance reports to technical assistance providers.

Monitoring

Although states had made progress in dismantling their old systems of monitoring for compliance with program provisions, they had far to go in building new monitoring procedures that would send a clear message to districts about a new, standards-based accountability framework.

- The purpose of monitoring has changed fast. Numerous administrators gave some variant of the following statement: "We don't do monitoring anymore. We provide assistance to districts to improve program quality."

- Rather than focusing on districts that might be out of compliance or where student performance was low, program managers seemed more likely to go to the districts that invited them in. Very few program managers (13 percent) reported that monitoring visits were triggered by information about student performance.

- With downsizing of state administrative staffs, program-specific monitoring visits have become infrequent. The majority of respondents for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Eisenhower Professional Development, Title VI, and Neglected or Delinquent said that fewer than one-fourth of their subgrantees received monitoring visits in the past 12 months. Integrated monitoring visits appeared to be the coming trend among federally funded programs; already, about 27 states conducted some form of integrated monitoring visits.

- According to administrators, integrated monitoring--by virtue of its focus on several programs at one time--does limit their ability to collect extensive program-specific information needed to determine whether programs are operating within the law. In addition, administrators warned that the integrated monitoring teams would overwhelm small districts where one person may administer several programs and that team members might lack the expertise to help individual programs.

- Many states' integrated monitoring teams did not include some of the smaller, discretionary grant programs (e.g., Even Start, Migrant Education, and Homeless Education).

Technical Assistance and Professional Development: Are States Working Strategically to Build Capacity?

Programs varied a great deal in their attention to building local capacity around standards, assessment, or whole-school improvement; these topics were reportedly important in Title I but less so in other programs. Administrators were, however, learning to work together in technical assistance and professional development.

Technical Assistance

Agency downsizing in many SEAs reduced the technical assistance capacity in federal programs. With limited resources, program administrators had to make difficult choices about where to provide assistance.

- Rather than actively assessing local capacity to respond to the new legislation, many said they were relying on districts to know when they needed help and how to ask for it.
- "Meeting the needs of special populations" was the most frequently selected technical assistance topic across all programs, suggesting that technical assistance remained largely responsive to program-specific issues rather than to a cross-cutting agenda of standards, assessment, whole-school improvement, and data-driven decisionmaking.
- The content of technical assistance varied widely by program. However, more than two-thirds of Title I and Goals 2000 administrators showed coordination in the content of the assistance they provided: each of these programs provided or funded technical assistance in standards, assessment, whole-school improvement, and data-driven decisionmaking.

Professional Development

Regarding the content of professional development, federal programs seemed more inclined to encourage a smorgasbord of topics rather than a tight focus. In addition, data analyses suggest that within any given state, there was little agreement among program administrators regarding the content of professional development.

- Program administrators were promoting some approaches to professional development that were often described as good ways of improving teaching and learning. Two-thirds of federal program managers reported that they were discouraging one-shot events in professional development. Close to that same number said they encouraged professional development organized for teams of individuals from a particular school.
- Virtually every state administrator of Title I and an overwhelming majority in Eisenhower Professional Development encouraged districts to pool funds for professional development across federal programs. Overall, 72 percent of all administrators did so, but the percentage varied somewhat by program. Title I was the program most often cited as a program with which other programs should pool their funds.

Conclusions

In the first few years of implementation of Goals 2000 and the reauthorized ESEA and homeless programs, SEAs had taken major steps toward cross-program communication in their own agencies, and many program administrators had also communicated a message of broad program change to their districts. Effects were beginning to emerge, although they were not as large as some might wish.

- All SEAs made noticeable changes to their procedures in implementing the reauthorized programs. Consolidated plans were almost universal, and the planning process had helped inform administrators about each others' programs; in many cases, planning had also given them new ideas about ways to work together. This collaborative work was beginning to result in the acceptance, albeit limited, of consolidated plans from local school districts and in integrated monitoring visits across programs.

- Most program administrators gave little evidence that they were attending to student performance. Having largely dismantled their old monitoring systems, few were sending a strong message to their districts that accountability for student performance would replace the compliance monitoring of the past.

- Compliance monitoring was being replaced with technical assistance--primarily offered to districts that knew when and how to ask for it.

In short, new procedures for program administration (such as consolidated state planning) were driving a good deal of change. Downsizing and SEA reorganizations were also responsible for changes in program management. Largely missing from the understanding of most program administrators, however, was any urgent press to organize their day-to-day work around aligning program services and operations with the expectations for students' academic performance embodied in state content and performance standards.

I. Introduction

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA), which amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, were enacted in 1994. Together they provided a comprehensive system of support for state and local education reform initiatives intended to enhance children's educational achievement. This federal legislation promoted the use of federal funds to support systemic, standards-based approaches to improving the quality of teaching and learning. Specifically, these federally supported elementary and secondary programs set an ambitious agenda of policy changes, including supporting states in the development of:

- Challenging state standards of curriculum content and student performance
- High-quality student assessment systems that are aligned with challenging state content and student performance standards so as to measure student attainment of such standards
- Sustained, intensive professional development aligned with challenging state standards

Goals 2000 and the programs reauthorized under IASA also promoted a more coordinated, coherent approach to program administration; the barriers between categorical programs were removed. Specifically, the laws allowed state administrators of federal programs to coordinate and consolidate their administrative functions so as to minimize the burden and cost and thereby redirect their programs to support broader state policy initiatives, such as the implementation of standards. These laws also offered greater decisionmaking authority and flexibility to school administrators and teachers in exchange for greater responsibility for student performance.

State education agencies play a crucial role in implementing the new laws: they are a primary source of information and guidance for local school districts; and the states have the lead role in setting academic standards and deciding how to assess student progress. Goals 2000 and the reauthorized ESEA encouraged state administrators of federal programs to use new approaches in program management--to communicate a more concerted focus on improving students' chances of meeting high standards, and to pull administrative operations together across categorical programs. This study, conducted under contract with the Planning and Evaluation Service in the Office of the Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Education (ED), focuses on the work of these key administrators at the state level. It evaluates early state implementation of IASA and Goals 2000 and analyzes the ways in which state administrators of federally funded programs have responded to the new legislative framework.

The Nine Federal Programs Studied

This study focuses on Goals 2000 and eight programs under the Improving America's Schools Act, which amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Stewart B. McKinney Act. The programs vary in purpose, size, and funding arrangements, but each one has given the states a key role to play in communicating program purposes and procedures to local districts. The programs included in this study are (in order of size):[2]

- ***Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965: Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards; Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*** (amended by IASA). Supports local educational agencies in improving teaching and learning to help low-achieving students in high-poverty schools meet the same challenging state content and performance standards that apply to all students. Promotes effective instructional strategies that increase the amount and quality of learning time for at-risk children and that deliver an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Also expands eligibility of schools for schoolwide programs that serve all children in high-poverty schools; encourages school-based planning; establishes accountability based on results; promotes effective parental participation; and supports coordination with health and social services.

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants
  FY 1997 Appropriation: $7.295 billion

- ***Title IV, ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities.*** Supports Goal Seven of the National Education Goals by encouraging comprehensive approaches to make schools and neighborhoods safe and drug-free. Provides funds to governors, state educational agencies (SEAs), LEAs, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit entities for a variety of drug and violence prevention programs.

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants
  FY 1997 Appropriation: $556 million

- ***Title III, Goals 2000: Educate America Act: State and Local Education Systemic Improvement.*** Seeks to "improve the quality of education for all students by improving student learning through a long-term, broad-based effort to promote coherent and coordinated improvements in the system of education throughout the nation at the state and local levels" (Sec. 302).

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants to states; discretionary grants to districts.
  FY 1997 Appropriation: $476 million

---

[2] The IASA program descriptions are taken from U.S. Department of Education, *Cross-Cutting Guidance for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (Washington: September 1996); the descriptions of Goals 2000 and Education for Homeless Children and Youth are taken from the statutes.

- ***Title II, ESEA: Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program.*** Concentrates on upgrading the expertise of teachers and other school staff to enable them to teach all children to challenging state content standards. Supports sustained and intensive high-quality professional development, focused on achieving high performance standards in mathematics, science, and other core academic subjects.

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants
  FY 1997 Appropriation: $310 million

- ***Title VI, ESEA: Innovative Education Program Strategies.*** Provides broad support for activities that encourage school reform and educational innovation.

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants
  FY 1997 Appropriation: $310 million

- ***Title I, ESEA, Part C: Education of Migratory Children.*** Supports educational programs for migratory children to help reduce the educational disruptions and other problems that result from repeated moves. Helps provides migratory children with the same opportunities as other children to meet challenging state content and performance standards. Targets efforts on the most mobile children, whose schooling is most likely to be disrupted.

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants
  FY 1997 Appropriation: $305 million

- ***Title I, ESEA, Part B: Even Start Family Literacy.*** Improves the educational opportunities of low-income families by integrating early childhood education, adult literacy or adult basic education, and parenting education into a unified family literacy program.

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants to state education agencies, which in turn make discretionary grants to partnerships of local education agencies and nonprofit community-based organizations or other nonprofit organizations; federal discretionary grants for projects that serve migratory children and their families, Indian tribes, tribal organizations, the outlying areas, and a project in a prison housing women and preschool-aged children; and to states for statewide family literacy initiatives.

  FY 1997 Appropriation: $102 million

- ***Title I, ESEA, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk of Dropping Out.*** Extends educational services and learning time in state institutions and community-day programs for neglected and delinquent children and youth. Encourages smooth transitions to enable participants to continue schooling or enter the job market upon leaving the institution. Supports programs in which school districts collaborate with locally operated correctional facilities to prepare youth in these facilities for high school completion, training, and employment and to operate dropout prevention programs.

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants to state education agencies; discretionary grants to state agencies and local education agencies
  FY 1997 Appropriation: $39 million

- ***Subtitle VII-B of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youth*** (amended by IASA). Requires states to "review and undertake steps to revise ... laws, regulations, or policies that may act as a barrier to the enrollment, attendance, or success in school of homeless children and youth to ensure that homeless children and youth are afforded the same free, appropriate public education as provided to other children and youth" (Sec. 721); and supports "activities for and services to homeless children ... and homeless youth" (Sec. 722).

  Type of Assistance: Formula grants to state education agencies; discretionary grants to local education agencies
  FY 1997 Appropriation: $25 million

Study Purposes and Research Questions

The evaluation's purposes were derived from ED's larger framework of data collection and analysis for the National Assessment of Title I (Sec. 1501) and a comprehensive evaluation of federal support for elementary and secondary reform (Sec. 14701), an assessment authorized by ESEA. In consultation with an Independent Review Panel of state and local educators, researchers, and other citizens, ED decided to focus on the following aspects of program implementation at the state and local levels: high academic standards for all children; assessment and evaluation; support for enriching curriculum and instruction; flexibility coupled with accountability for student performance; and targeting of resources.

Cutting across these topical areas of focus are this study's questions about administrative processes at the state level:

- How are state program managers currently implementing the law's provisions?
- How has implementation changed when compared with state practices under the predecessor programs?

- What federal and state factors underlie these changes?

This study, then, focused on changes in program administration after the 1994 reauthorization of federal programs under ESEA and the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act and the enactment of Goals 2000. It explored early state-level progress (i.e., in the two years following the 1994 reauthorization of ESEA and McKinney) toward administering the federal programs in ways that:

- Make use of increased flexibility across programs
- Make programs more accountable for student performance
- Support improvements in teaching and learning

These elements of state program administration form the organizing structure for this report: each of the next three chapters presents findings related to one of the above elements; a concluding chapter discusses overall trends in state administration of federal programs.

Study Methods

Surveys were administered during late fall 1996 and early winter 1997 (approximately two years after the reauthorization of ESEA and the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act and 2.5 years after the authorization of Goals 2000) in all 51 state education agencies (including the District of Columbia) to state-level managers of each of nine federal programs plus state research or evaluation specialists knowledgeable about assessment in the Title I program (henceforth referred to as Title I assessment experts), for a total of 510 possible respondents. Respondents did not complete paper-and-pencil surveys. Instead, each survey was administered as a personal interview with standard questions, some of them closed-ended and some open-ended. The surveys were conducted in person in 14 states and via telephone for the remaining 37 states. The interviewers recorded all responses on written forms. Responses to closed-ended questions were tabulated; responses to open-ended questions were coded for tabulation as well as yielding more elaborated information.

To explore cross-cutting matters such as state procedures in planning or professional development under all nine programs, we created a core survey to be administered to state-level managers of all the programs. For Goals 2000, the core survey was streamlined by removing (1) all the questions asking respondents to compare the reauthorized law to the previous law (because Goals 2000 is new legislation) and (2) questions about waivers of program provisions (which are available from ED for provisions of the ESEA programs and Subtitle VII-B of the McKinney Act but not for provisions of Goals 2000). By asking

so many identical questions across programs, the survey enabled us to present comparative findings throughout this report. In some cases, however, cross-program differences reflect real policy differences in program purposes and approaches; this study's approach should not be construed as implying that all programs ought to be administered identically. For six of the nine programs, tailored questions about mandated targeting, assessment, and other administrative procedures were added to the core survey. Finally, a separate survey was developed and administered to each state's Title I assessment expert.

Out of a possible 510 surveys, 485 were completed (129 in person and 356 by telephone), a response rate of 95 percent.

Survey Respondents

To identify our respondents, we called each individual identified by ED as the state contact person or coordinator for each of the nine programs in each of the 50 states plus the District of Columbia. We asked that person if they would be able to answer questions about state plans, subgrant applications, project monitoring, waivers, accountability, professional development, and technical assistance under that program. We also asked for the name of anyone else in federal program administration at the state level whom we should interview regarding these issues.

The respondents we ultimately identified and interviewed were managers who: (1) often administered more than one federal or state program; (2) varied in the length of their administrative experience; (3) worked out of a variety of offices and divisions that might or might not be housed in the state education agency (SEA); and (4) might supervise or be supervised by other respondents to this survey. In addition:

- State administrators of Title I, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Goals 2000 tended to be relatively high-ranking veterans of SEAs. In several cases, for example, Goals 2000 administrators were deputy or associate chief state school officers. As such, the Goals 2000 administrators tended to provide a broader view of education reform as it related to both state and federal education program initiatives. Administrators of the other federally funded programs included in this study were more often middle or first-tier managers in the SEA.

- In many cases, the Even Start program was housed in a separate division--and sometimes a separate agency--from other federally funded education programs.

- Four discretionary grants programs (Even Start, Migrant Education, Neglected or Delinquent, and Education for Homeless Children and Youth) tended to have experienced

relatively high turnover among their coordinators. Consequently, state-level staff coordinating these programs were sometimes unable to reflect back on program administration and operations prior to the 1994 reauthorization of ESEA and the McKinney Act.

- The Title I coordinator was often the respondent for both the Title I and Neglected or Delinquent programs; respondents for the Eisenhower Professional Development and Title VI programs were sometimes the same person.

Finally, it is important to note that there were a number of legislative provisions in both Goals 2000 and IASA that this study did not address, usually because the provisions were covered by other ED-funded studies conducted as part of the National Assessment of Title I and the comprehensive evaluation of federal support for elementary and secondary reform. For example, this study did not address issues pertaining to: (1) parent involvement; (2) Ed-Flex authority; (3) targeting and resource allocation; and (4) preschool-to-school and school-to-work transitions.

II. Flexibility: Do States and Districts Experience New Latitude in Meeting the Laws' Challenges?

According to the reauthorized Title I, "Decentralized decisionmaking is a key ingredient of systemic reform. Schools need the resources, flexibility, and authority to design and implement effective strategies for bringing their children to high levels of performance" [Sec.1001(c)(8)]. To help states in their efforts to raise the academic achievement of all students to high standards--recognizing that there may be many ways to do so--Goals 2000 and IASA amendments attempted to offer states greater flexibility in the use of federal program resources and in the administration of federal program services. This flexibility for states mirrored the flexibility that policymakers sought to offer to schools and school districts. Believing that schools, districts, and states should have the freedom to do whatever it would take to raise students' achievement, unencumbered by administrative barriers, the laws encouraged cross-program planning, consolidation of administrative funding, and waivers of specific program provisions.

In this chapter, we discuss the extent to which state program administrators (1) perceived that their flexibility had increased in the two years after the reauthorization of ESEA and the McKinney Act (henceforth referred to as the Homeless program), (2) were using each of several specific provisions for cross-program coordination,[3] and (3) had observed changes in flexibility at the local level.

States' Administrative Flexibility

"Flexibility" throughout the intergovernmental system is a watchword of IASA. Two years after authorization, did state administrators of IASA programs think their own flexibility had increased? And what had they done to avail themselves of various options intended to increase flexibility and cross-program coordination?

---

[3] Title XIV, Parts B, C, and D allows SEAs to: (1) consolidate administrative funds for elementary and secondary education programs, provided that the SEA can demonstrate that the majority of its resources come from non-federal sources (Sec. 14201); (2) submit consolidated state plans in order to simplify application requirements and reduce the burden for SEAs under IASA (Sec. 14302); and (3) apply for waivers, for themselves or on behalf of districts, of statutory or regulatory requirements under IASA (Sec. 14401).

Perceptions of Increased Flexibility

State administrators of ESEA and Homeless programs offered a mixed assessment of the extent to which their own flexibility had increased in the first two years after authorization. Many argued that their programs had always offered flexibility. This was especially true in Title VI, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities. One Title VI administrator's comment represented this perspective: "Flexibility has always been there; it really hasn't changed." Title I was the only program in which most administrators reported an increase in flexibility at the state level: 32 of them reported an increase, and 17 of these characterized the increase as "considerable." (Twelve said it was too early to tell, and five said their flexibility had not increased at all.) In no other program, however, did a majority of state administrators perceive an increase in their flexibility. The number reporting any increase ranged from 21 in Eisenhower Professional Development (where 11 called the increase "considerable") down to 11 (including just 3 choosing the term "considerable") in Even Start (Table 1). Overall, outside Title I, state administrators were very close to being evenly divided among those who said their flexibility had increased a considerable extent or somewhat (35 percent), those who said it was too early to tell (33 percent), and those who said state flexibility had not increased at all (32 percent).

The perception of increased flexibility also varied by state. In 12 states, most of the ESEA and Homeless program administrators (most often five out of eight) reported at least some increase in their flexibility; in 11 states, on the other hand, no more than one administrator reported an increase. In the nine states that were participating in the Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Program (Ed-Flex) as of late 1996,[4] 46 percent of all administrators reported an increase in flexibility; in the non-Ed-Flex states, the figure was 38 percent.

---

[4] Established by the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Ed-Flex gives participating states the power to waive requirements of certain federal education programs, including Title I and the Eisenhower Professional Development Programs in exchange for increased accountability for results. Without Ed-Flex, states and school districts may ask the Secretary of Education to waive these requirements; with Ed-Flex, states have the authority to make those decisions at the state level. [Ed-Flex Fact Sheet. USED, 1996]

Table 1

Extent to Which State Administrators Find the Reauthorized Legislation Gives Them More Administrative Flexibility Than They Had Before the Reauthorization, by Program (N=392)[1]

Taking into account all of your offices responsibilities under this program, to what extent do you find that this legislation gives you more administrative flexibility than you had before the reauthorization?				
	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Reauthorization Gives Them Administrative Flexibility:			
Federally Funded Education Programs	**To a Considerable Extent**	**Somewhat**	**Not at All**	**Too Early to Tell**
Title I, Part A (N=50)	17	15	5	12
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	7	8	12	23
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	11	10	12	16
Title VI (N=50)	8	9	20	12
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	5	11	15	14
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	3	8	20	17
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	9	10	14	13
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	4	12	15	15
TOTAL	64	83	113	122

Table reads: Seventeen state directors of Title I, Part A reported that the reauthorized legislation gives them more administrative flexibility than they had before the reauthorization.

[1] Respondents were administrators of the eight reauthorized ESEA programs (excluding Goals 2000, which is new, not reauthorized legislation).

What Did "State Flexibility" Mean to State Administrators?

In describing the administrative flexibility available to them since reauthorization, state program managers expressed three major themes: (1) the opportunity to coordinate and collaborate with other federally funded programs; (2) the opportunity to approve a wider range of local program designs, often because of specific changes in their program's authorizing law; and (3) pooling of state staff and other resources. We also found that the perception of flexibility was related to specific changes in state program administration procedures.

Coordination and collaboration among administrators. In responses to a variety of open-ended survey questions, many respondents talked about the new opportunity to coordinate and collaborate with other program administrators. The following comments were typical:

> It's allowed us to work with all programs integrated under one umbrella; [we] plan across programs [now]. (Title I)

> [We are] able to work with other people we've never worked with before--all other federal titles. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

In some cases, respondents took this theme a step farther and cited benefits to schools or students that could result from their coordination and collaboration:

> More people are involved in looking at the programs or schools that are most in need. (Title I)

> We can consolidate programs and work together; there is an opportunity to think about possibilities for helping students achieve more. (Title I)

> A lot more people in the SEA are familiar with Title VI, which allows them to be better resources to LEAs and to be better about finding links among programs. (Title VI)

> By virtue of [IASA] team participation, we have ongoing learning and cross-training. It puts more visibility on the homeless, and continuation of services for homeless students is much greater. We are reaching into all schools, not just those with McKinney money. (Education for Homeless Children and Youth)

Flexibility to approve a wider range of local choices. A second theme in the administrators' comments was that of increased flexibility in local service delivery, often because of particular provisions in the new legislation. For example, state coordinators of Eisenhower Professional Development mentioned the broadening of program content beyond mathematics and science. Coordinators of Even

Start mentioned flexibility in planning grants and in joint funding. Again, some administrators went on to make the connection to improvements in services or student outcomes:

> The law is generally more flexible. I'm much more likely to say "yes" to district requests. The intent now is to do good for kids. We work with districts to figure out a way to let them do good things for kids. (Title I)

> It has allowed us to put the focus on achievement ... has removed excuses for non-performance... especially the bureaucratic requirements as an excuse to avoid the focus on achievement. (Title I)

> We're now moving in one direction ... concentrating on serving the child now rather than on program parameters. (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities)

> It gives us the freedom to talk about different reform models--ones that are focused more on school improvement in general. (Title VI)

Not every state administrator applauded local flexibility. A few veteran managers, recalling past abuses, expressed concern about it:

> You can do anything you want to do, you can really do anything you want to do. That bothers me as an old-time bureaucrat because that's when you start having abuses. Time will tell, won't it? (Title VI)

Consolidation of state administrative funding. Many respondents also referred to their state's consolidation of administrative funding, which gave them greater flexibility in the use of time, resources, and staff. Among the managers who said their state was consolidating its administrative funds across federal programs, 45 percent reported an increase in flexibility; among those who said their state was not consolidating funds, 33 percent reported greater flexibility. The following comments were typical:

> We have the flexibility to allow staff to work across programs. Before, we had to look at time and effort for the specific program person assigned to it. (Title I)

> [The law] allows us to fund workshops without specifically saying what dollars came out of what program. (Title I)

Changes in procedures for working with local districts. Respondents' views on the extent of increase in their flexibility were related to the extent to which their programs were using new administrative procedures. The more areas of state program administration to which programs reported making changes since the reauthorization (i.e., in procedures for local applications, monitoring, professional development, or technical assistance), the more likely they were to report finding that the

legislation gave them more administrative flexibility. There may well be some interaction of cause and effect in this relationship: those state administrators who heard and believed the federal message that the legislation offered flexibility were probably the first to make changes in their procedures, but the changes in program procedures probably also resulted in administrators experiencing greater flexibility.

Although fewer than half of all state administrators believed the legislation increased their flexibility in carrying out their program responsibilities, most reported taking advantage of at least some of the flexibility provisions in the law. The following discussion addresses the types of flexibility provisions states used, including consolidated planning, consolidation of administrative funds, consolidated plans and applications from districts and other subgrantees, and waivers.

State Consolidated Planning

According to ED's cross-cutting guidance regarding state implementation of the IASA amendments, consolidated planning would enable states "to plan how to use all of their federal funds to support overall state goals" (USED, 1996; p.7). All but one state submitted a consolidated plan, and most administrators report in this survey that the process was both inclusive and worthwhile.

Collectively, almost all state administrators of the eight programs in this study (92 percent) participated in the development of their state's consolidated plan in 1996. Although we do not know how intensive their participation may have been, at least they report having been "at the table." The rate of participation did not vary much across programs, ranging from 48 of the 50 Title I coordinators down to 41 of the 48 coordinators of Education for Homeless Children and Youth.

Critics of the planning process. Although administrators who did not participate in planning represented a small fraction of all administrators, they were quick to register their concern when we asked them, in an open-ended question, to elaborate on their experiences with consolidated planning. "I have never seen the plan," a Title VI coordinator said emphatically. Some participants, too, had criticisms. A coordinator of Migrant Education had submitted information to a committee that wrote the plan but did not feel that the process or the plan gave her an opportunity to discuss important program details. Similarly, the coordinator of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities in another state regretted the loss of control over the plan's content:

> I submitted what I thought should go in, but it was changed by others in the name of consolidation. Things I thought should be included were not there. For example, the measurable goals didn't come out as I wanted.

A Title VI coordinator lamented the missed opportunities to grapple with program purposes and approaches, expressing regret that the SEA had focused instead on the mechanics of producing a written plan:

> We were asked to look at the Title I plan and their format.... Rather than all of us sitting together to discuss what are the needs of all students and what do we need to do, how can we use funds to accomplish our goals, ... they started with Title I. I support the IASA premise of coordination. Coordination should happen and we should meet regularly. But putting it into a single document was hard and confusing to the states.... The only other meetings we've had at the state level are to make amendments to the plan for next year. There are no real planning and consolidation meetings to talk about the plan. No conversations are happening like: "Where are we six months later? What's working? What can we do to plan and coordinate better?"... For real consolidated planning to happen, we need models of coordination and integration of services and how funding sources can work together.... The work and process of planning needs to be emphasized, and deemphasize the written document.

Planning as a means of informing administrators about other programs. When asked to describe their participation, most administrators were quite enthusiastic about the consolidated planning process and the extent to which this process helped inform them--in many cases for the first time--about the activities of other state program administrators and about ways federally funded programs can work together. Indeed, program managers like to know about each others' programs; they want to work together because it makes educational sense and because it is practical in the face of SEA downsizing, as a number of state administrators explained:

> There's greater cross-program collaboration. We're learning about other projects and programs, enabling all staff to be informed about the migrant (and other) programs. (Migrant Education)

> Consolidated planning has lead to increased cooperation, and more serious recognition of and awareness by federal program personnel that [all IASA programs exist and] need to be addressed. (Education for Homeless Children and Youth)

> [Because of consolidated planning] we now know what other programs are doing and we're participating in each other's meetings. (Title I)

> [Consolidated planning was] the first time we took the time to sit down and think about how resources from various programs could be coordinated and realized that many programs share common goals. (Neglected or Delinquent)

> [The consolidated planning process] got us to look across different IASA programs. We would not have looked at other resources and the plans of other programs otherwise. We found a lot of duplication of services and eliminated them to the extent we could. (Title I)

> [Consolidated planning encourages integration of various programs, maximizes resources and reduces duplication [of services]. With consolidated planning, [we] look at other programs and

see how we're more alike than different. Consolidated planning demonstrates how programs can integrate services and resources. (Even Start)

[Through consolidated planning] we can do things in an integrated way and we've decreased the amount of service duplication. Through consolidated planning, we've helped folks understand what other programs are about and how we can work together. (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities)

An early stage of collaboration. Despite the enthusiasm for consolidated planning, many state administrators' comments reflected a preliminary stage of collaborating. Program administrators were still learning how to communicate with each other and break down categorical program barriers, as the following Title VI director's comments suggested:

> Although we don't know how to talk to each other, we're learning, and that's the exciting part of this process. We're learning through joint meetings at the state level, and we're trying to model the coordination. We're getting to know where the programs are--where the coordinates are and where are the points where we can all meet.

Indeed, it was not clear, based on state administrators' comments, how consolidated planning was translating into coordinated program services and operations; many administrators seemed to be just planning for planning's sake:

> The consolidated plan exists on paper, but implementation remains elusive. (Education for Homeless Children and Youth)
>
> The consolidated plan emphasizes the document itself and not the planning and coordination of services--the process. (Title VI)
>
> ...we talk and write about collaboration, but we're only in the early stages of actually doing it. (Education for Homeless Children and Youth)

In fact, based on state administrators' comments we were only able to identify a handful of specific examples of coordinating the activities of two or more programs for a common goal. In Virginia, for example, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program planned to be a partner in the summer Migrant program for high school students. In Kentucky, the homeless program was "piggy-backing" on the state's Extended School Services Program to provide tutoring services rather than providing such services separately. A few other states also cited specific examples of coordinated program services and activities resulting from consolidated planning; however, they are the exception rather than the rule.

The role of smaller federal programs in the plan. Although most respondents, in answering various open-ended survey questions, applauded the opportunity to do consolidated planning, there was more dissent among administrators of the smaller programs--Migrant Education, Even Start, and Education for Homeless Children and Youth. They expressed concern about the risk of overlooking the needs of the populations of children they targeted and served. One coordinator of Migrant Education typified this concern, saying that the changes resulting from consolidated planning were not "advantageous" as far as he was concerned. He cautioned that the consolidated plan did not afford him enough opportunity to specify what his program was doing and that the integration of programs may "dilute services to migrant children." He said his annual plan had shrunk from 70 pages to half a page in the consolidated plan. A Homeless Coordinator did not view consolidated planning as a positive development because it reduced the specificity with which programs were required to articulate their goals; he explained that this also limited the ability of program administrators to articulate the depth of the problems their programs face and what needs to be done about them. An Even Start Coordinator explained that consolidated planning creates the opportunity for small programs to be absorbed by larger ones. As she explained, "We need to make sure that the reason for enacting these programs is not forgotten."

However, some of these programs' state administrators viewed consolidated planning as a welcome chance to work in a larger arena and garner more attention to the populations their programs serve. One state illustrates the contrast in perspectives. This state had formed a team, cutting across the ESEA programs, to handle consolidated planning, joint application workshops, and integrated monitoring. The one administrator who did not participate in developing the consolidated plan, the Migrant Education coordinator, expressed reservations about it, saying it was too global and differed "a great deal" from the plan that would have been developed for Migrant Education alone:

> [The plan contains] very little on Migrant Education; [it takes] more of a global view of how IASA programs could run in a state, but the plan doesn't tell how programs are actually run in the state.... The state plan is useless as far as I am concerned.

Yet the State Coordinator of Education for Homeless Children and Youth in the same state expressed enthusiasm for the planning process, in which he had participated, and for the chance to "link efforts" with all the other programs:

> [Consolidated planning] made a much greater impact than if I were doing it all alone. We're approaching the school holistically.

These two perspectives illustrate the tradeoff between the more specific program plans of the past, which had the advantage of spelling out in detail and at length what would be done for each population, and

the broader plans emerging from a team effort, which can potentially put a small student population on the agenda of every state administrator and thus of every school. Among state administrators of the smaller programs, opinion is divided at this early stage about the benefits of consolidated planning.

Consolidated Administrative Funding

Each federal program allows state education agencies to set aside a small percentage of the funds for state-level program administration. These set-asides typically pay the salaries of state coordinators as well as covering the other expenses of application review, technical assistance, monitoring, and the like. The IASA law allowed states to make a change in the way they accounted for these funds: it authorized them to consolidate into a single pool the administrative set-asides under Title I, Even Start, Migrant Education, Neglected or Delinquent, Eisenhower Professional Development, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Title VI, and Goals 2000.

Not every state was eligible for this consolidation; the law provided this option only for SEAs in which the majority of the agency's resources came from nonfederal sources. Among those that were eligible, it appears that some did not choose to consolidate funds and some were selective about including programs in the consolidation.

Extent to which state administrators experienced a consolidation of administrative funds. In just nine states did state administrators of the eligible programs report an across-the-board consolidation of state administrative funds; in another eight, none answered "yes" to this question (i.e., all administrators said either "no" or "don't know"). Aside from these 17 states where the picture was clear, an additional 11 states had just one administrator whose report differed from that of his or her colleagues (e.g., there were seven "no" answers and one "yes," or seven "yes" answers and one "no" or "don't know").

The remaining 24 states presented a murkier picture, with two or more state administrators disagreeing with their colleagues; a typical pattern of responses in these states was two saying "yes," four "no," and one "don't know." These may have been states in which consolidation had been put in place on a limited basis, across just two of these eight programs (and perhaps others outside these eight). Only 39 (or 11 percent) of the 344 state administrators surveyed said they did not know whether their state was consolidating funds; of these, Even Start coordinators were the most numerous, with 11.

Effects of consolidating administrative funds. To get a sense of the effects of consolidation, we can look at two groups of respondents: those in the nine SEAs in which all state administrators answered

"yes" to the consolidation question; and all respondents who answered "yes," regardless of what their colleagues said.

Among the nine states where all eight state administrators said funds had been consolidated--where the experience of consolidation could be expected to be most intense--there were six states in which most respondents said their work had been at least "somewhat" affected by administrative-funds consolidation. Typical comments came from a state where six administrators reported that their work was "somewhat" affected, and where they understood that the purpose of consolidation had been to facilitate joint monitoring and technical assistance. The coordinator of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities said of this cross-program work:

> I think it's a good idea. It's allowing us to learn about all the other programs by being on site. We're seeing how they can fit together.

In two of the nine states with a blanket consolidation of funds, administrators tended to report that consolidation had affected their own work "to a considerable extent." Both of these SEAs had moved toward not just consolidated state planning but also consolidated application workshops and monitoring for local districts. In one, the programs had been grouped in a single division--and, at the same time, the agency had been downsized. Thus, the reportedly considerable effects of consolidated administrative funding may have been connected to the anxiety that respondents consistently expressed about overall agency capacity to work with districts. In the other SEA, where five administrators reported a "considerable" effect from consolidated administrative funding, most saw the effect as negative: the coordinator of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities reported having the same workload with less money; the coordinator of Migrant Education agreed that the change had limited the program's resources and capacity to provide technical assistance; and the Even Start coordinator said it slowed the process of getting funds approved for conferences. Only the Title I coordinator (who controlled most of the consolidated funds) praised the effects of consolidation in broadening administrators' expertise and simplifying accounting procedures.

Finally, in one state where all eight state administrators said funds had been consolidated, most of them said that funds consolidation had not affected their own work at all. This response seemed to reflect a combination of perceptions: that they had already worked with one another before the reauthorization; and that the change had not affected the way they worked with local districts.

Looking at all the state administrators across all states who said their agency had consolidated administrative funds, 55 percent reported some effect on their own work (Table 2). Often, they cited the

lifting of a requirement to keep "time and effort" logs; some said that this helped them work more effectively or efficiently:

> For administrators who work on several federal programs, we no longer have to keep time and effort logs of our work on each program. You know your time doesn't have to be divided between programs, so it's more of an all-encompassing effort. (Title VI)

> It is a more productive and efficient use of your time when you can concentrate on addressing needs, and you don't have to allocate your time to discrete programs. (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities)

The contribution of consolidating administrative funds to cross-program planning was not so clear. That is, few respondents described consolidation of administrative funding as making it "easier to plan across programs," in the words of ED's cross-cutting guidance. It may be true, however, that reducing the need for recording time and effort allowed program administrators to think less categorically and more in terms of cross-program goals, as two administrators' comments suggested:

> Relaxing the time and effort requirement has reduced paperwork and increased cross-over to other programs. We can spend as much time as we want now working with other programs, and we're now working more holistically with other programs. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

> Instead of focusing only on Title I requirements, I can think about how the requirements fit together across the board; [there are] lots of opportunities for partnerships to help the same group of kids. (Title I)

Those who did not perceive effects from the consolidation of funds included most of those administrators of the Migrant Education and Neglected or Delinquent programs who thought their agencies had consolidated funds. It is quite likely that their programs' administrative funds had not been included in the consolidation. Alternatively, some of them might have worked in concert with Title I before the reauthorization and thus perceived no change. Furthermore, because Migrant Education and Neglected or Delinquent programs typically serve children outside the regular school

Table 2

Extent to Which Consolidation of Administrative Funding Affects the Way Administrators Do Their Job, by Program (N=164)[1]

To what extent has this consolidation of funds affected the way you do your job?				
	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Consolidation of Funds Has Affected Their Job:			
Federally Funded Education Programs	To a Considerable Extent	Somewhat	Not at All	Other
Title I, Part A (N=28)	11	9	8	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=23)	8	7	7	1
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=24)	7	6	11	0
Title VI (N=25)	10	5	9	1
Education of Migratory Children (N=25)	3	6	15	1
Even Start Family Literacy (N=18)	6	4	8	0
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=21)	3	6	12	0
TOTAL	48	43	70	3

Table reads: Eleven state directors of Title I, Part A reported that the consolidation of administrative funds affects the way they do their job to a considerable extent.

[1] Respondents for State Goals 2000 programs were not included in the portion of the survey pertaining to the consolidation of administrative funding. Also, because the Education for Homeless Children and Youth program was not included among the programs ESEA authorized to consolidate state administrative funding, data from the Homeless Coordinators are not reported in this table.

setting, they may have more limited opportunities to share administrative responsibilities related to, for example, monitoring. Many Migrant Education programs, for example, operate in the summer months, thus limiting the opportunities to participate in integrated monitoring visits during the regular school year. Neglected or Delinquent programs (Subpart 1) operate in state institutions, where other state administrators of federal education programs are unlikely to visit as part of their monitoring.

Local Administrative Flexibility

Goals 2000 and IASA amendments aimed to increase flexibility in schools and school districts so that administrative requirements would not impede progress in bringing all students to high standards. State administrators were asked to assess and describe the effects of the laws on local flexibility.

Perceptions of the Increase in Local Flexibility

State administrators differed a good deal across programs and states in their perception of an increase in local administrative flexibility in the reauthorized programs. ("Local" could refer to school districts, other subgrantees such as consortia of districts, and schools.) In Title I, half of the coordinators reported a "considerable" increase in local flexibility, and most of the rest said flexibility had increased "somewhat"; only a handful said it was too early to tell (Table 3). In no other program was there such a resounding perception of change. Title VI administrators were the ones most likely to see stability in this regard; almost half of them reported that flexibility had not increased at all. A wait-and-see attitude was especially widespread among coordinators of Education for Homeless Children and Youth (19 of 48 said it was too early to tell) and of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (19 of 50).

Some SEAs presented at least a fairly uniform perception on the issue of local flexibility. In six states, either all administrators or all but one agreed that local flexibility had increased at least somewhat; in an additional five states, two administrators dissented from the overall perception of greater local flexibility. At the other end of the spectrum were four states where one administrator, at most, saw an increase in local flexibility and another nine states where only two saw an increase.

Table 3

Extent to Which State Administrators Find the 1994 Reauthorizing Legislation Gives Local School Districts, Schools, and Other Subgrantees More Administrative Flexibility Than They Had before the Legislation, by Program (N=392)[1]

For local school districts, schools, or other subgrantees, to what extent do you find that this legislation gives more administrative flexibility than they had before the reauthorization?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Reauthorization Gives Locals Administrative Flexibility: To a Considerable Extent	Somewhat	Not at All	Too Early to Tell
Title I, Part A (N=50)	26	18	0	5
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	4	19	7	19
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	12	10	12	16
Title VI (N=50)	10	7	23	10
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	6	14	14	11
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	5	21	8	13
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	9	17	8	11
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	9	7	11	19
TOTAL	81	113	83	104

Table reads: Twenty-six state directors of Title I, Part A reported that they found, to a considerable extent, that the reauthorized legislation gives local school districts, schools, and other subgrantees more administrative flexibility than they had before the reauthorization.

[1] Respondents were administrators of the eight reauthorized ESEA programs (excluding Goals 2000, which is new, not reauthorized legislation).

What "Local Flexibility" Meant to Administrators

When describing how the reauthorization had increased local administrative flexibility, those state administrators who did perceive an increase most commonly elaborated by mentioning: (1) flexibility in the use of resources, staffing, and time; (2) opportunities to coordinate and collaborate with other programs; (3) increased availability of the option of schoolwide programs; and (4) devolution of decisionmaking authority from districts to schools.

More latitude in the use of staff and other resources. An emphasis on the procedural aspects of flexibility was very common in response to an open-ended question asking state administrators to elaborate on the ways in which local flexibility has increased since reauthorization. The following comments were typical; all of these came from the 11 states in which all but one or two ESEA or Homeless program administrators saw greater local flexibility:

> District administrators don't have to keep time and effort logs on the separate federal programs that they work on. (Title I)
>
> There is lump-sum budgeting now--fewer categorical funds, a larger discretionary chunk. (Title I)
>
> Districts can pool funds more. They feel better about their overall plan, less tied in to little boxes of funding. (Title VI)
>
> Districts can be really flexible in combining their efforts--planning professional development can be coordinated, [they can] combine staff positions and really use funds to meet their locally identified needs. (Education of Homeless Children and Youth)

Administrators usually went on to cite the more substantive benefits associated with local administrative flexibility, however, as we discuss next.

Coordination and collaboration across programs. Just as they had praised their own opportunities to learn about other programs and to work together for wider benefits, many administrators framed their description of local flexibility around the idea of cross-program planning. Again, the following comments came from the 11 states where perceptions of greater local flexibility were most widespread in the SEA:

> They don't have to spend so much time preparing separate applications. They can focus on their purpose--how to advance student achievement together. (Title I)
>
> They are able to plan globally, using people and resources. People are beginning to work together across programs. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

[They have a] collaborative approach to administering the program and a perceived responsibility to plan together. (Education for Homeless Children and Youth)

There is a new approach on how all programs in the school can be looked at as connected to make a difference. It gives more opportunity to make a difference than before. (Neglected or Delinquent)

In other states, too, SEA administrators saw cross-program collaboration as a key element of local flexibility. At this early stage in carrying out the reauthorized ESEA and Homeless programs, it is perhaps not surprising that planning seemed to loom larger in their vision of cross-program collaboration than did actual program implementation. The following descriptions were typical:

[They are] restructuring LEA-level activities so programs are integrated. LEAs increasingly have a single coordinator for programs under IASA and more. [They can] increase involvement through shared decisionmaking. (Title I)

LEAs are able to work and plan across programs without program-specific guidelines and regulations getting in the way. (Title I)

Because of the consolidated plan and its coordination with our own education reform, we have experienced a great deal of encouragement to develop an approach that works for [this state]. (Title VI)

Schoolwide programs. The 1994 Title I legislation substantially increased the number of schools eligible to operate schoolwide programs, in which Title I dollars can upgrade the school's entire program rather than being used only to serve selected students. The law expanded the availability of this option by lowering the threshold for school eligibility from 75 percent poverty to 50 percent (as of the 1996-97 school year). It also loosened the strings on commingling of other program funds in schoolwide programs.

This broadening of the opportunity to operate schoolwide programs has caught the attention of state program administrators in Title I and beyond. Very commonly, when state administrators elaborated on the notion of local flexibility (and that of state flexibility as well), it was the schoolwide-program option that they mentioned first.

[Through the schoolwide programs option, districts] have more authority to make decisions about what schools to serve, students to serve, and accountability; they have more decisions about how to integrate programs and coordinate through a schoolwide approach. (Title I)

Subgrantees that have chosen to partner with schoolwide programs have more flexibility. Others are unaffected. (Even Start)

> Before schoolwide programs, there may have been a waiting list for [migrant] kids to get into various programs; now that won't happen because all kids are included. (Migrant Education)
>
> There's more opportunity to implement schoolwide programs. I see more opportunity for a wider array of programs that they can administer [through the schoolwide program option]. (Title I)

School-level flexibility. Several provisions governing the ESEA and Homeless programs reflected a deliberate effort to shift decisionmaking authority and control of funds away from school districts' central offices and into school buildings. In Title I, in particular, some state administrators--in their responses to various open-ended questions pertaining to flexibility--said they had seen implementation of this policy change:

> Reauthorization has shifted the Title I power from the district level to the school level, so schools now have more flexibility. Title I was in a power position at the district level. Now the power base has shifted to the school. District directors are now more facilitators and supporters. (Title I)

However, as the following comments show, some state administrators also believed schools were reluctant to take advantage of the flexibility to coordinate and collaborate; these administrators said educators still preferred to operate within individual program rules and regulations:

> Schools have been imprisoned by rules and regulations. When you lift the [regulations] it's hard to convince them that they can use flexibility to their own advantage and they won't be cited by an auditor. (Title I)
>
> Schools can make decisions about how to integrate programs and coordinate through a schoolwide approach. [However] there's still some hesitance to coordinate because of the tradition of separate programs. (Title I)

State Versus Local Flexibility

Compared with the overall percentage of state administrators who believed the legislation brought *them* more flexibility (38 percent), more believed the legislation brought more flexibility to local school districts, other subgrantees, and schools (50 percent overall).

In the Even Start and Title I programs, the differences between administrators' views on state versus local flexibility brought by reauthorization were fairly large. This variation may be related to program-specific legislative changes that were viewed as increasing local-level--as opposed to state-level--flexibility. For example, Even Start coordinators may have seen their efforts to collaborate eased by the

Title I provision requiring local education agencies to write parent involvement policies that describe how they will coordinate with other programs, such as Even Start. In addition, many Even Start coordinators referred to schoolwide programs as easing efforts to coordinate family literacy activities: "...with schoolwide programs, it's easier for Even Start to be involved in some of those [schools]." Title I coordinators, too, often referred to the provision that lowered the eligibility threshold for schools to become schoolwide programs as bringing enormous flexibility to schools.

Local Consolidated Plans

Most state administrators responding to the survey allowed school districts or other subgrantees to submit a single consolidated application--a plan describing the intended uses of funds under more than one program. That is, about 60 percent of all program administrators reported that they required (22 percent) or accepted (38 percent) consolidated applications from districts. As usual, however, there were important program by program variations to this finding. More than three-fourths of the administrators for Title I, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Title VI reported requiring or accepting consolidated applications as compared with fewer than one-third of the administrators for Even Start and Education for Homeless Children and Youth (Table 4). In addition, when asked whether administrators conducted joint application workshops for subgrantees (see Table 11), those who responded yes most frequently cited Title I, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Title VI--or a subset of these--as among the programs with which they jointly conducted application workshops.

Consolidated applications or plans were more likely to be in place, then, across the programs that offered formula funding to districts. Administrators whose programs required them to make discretionary awards were a good deal less likely to ask for information in the context of other programs' plans. For example, Even Start and Education for Homeless Children and Youth, both of which target limited resources to districts most in need, were less likely than other programs to require or accept consolidated applications.[5] Goals 2000 also tended to require separate applications.

---

[5] For Even Start, this may also be a result of the fact that eligible entities for subgrant awards are not simply LEAs, but LEAs in partnership with at least one other entity, such as a non-profit, community-based organization.

Table 4

Policy on Consolidated District Applications, by Program (N=436)

Does your program require or accept consolidated applications (that is, combined applications for more that one program) from districts?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators Who Report That Their Program: Requires Consolidated Subgrant Applications	Requires or Accepts Consolidated Subgrant Applications	Requires a Separate Subgrant Application	Makes Other Arrangements for Subgrant Applications
Title I, Part A (N=50)	21	24	3	2
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	14	24	10	2
Goals 2000 (N=44)	5	10	27	2
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	17	24	6	3
Title VI (N=50)	16	23	10	1
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	9	20	14	3
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	1	14	31	3
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	10	14	21	3
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	2	11	32	2

Table reads: Twenty-one state directors of Title I, Part A reported that their program requires consolidated subgrant applications from districts.

Requiring or accepting consolidated subgrant applications was a new administrative procedure for most states.[6] It was probably simpler to introduce this procedure for a core group of programs, especially ones that were not targeting a particular population, to test the processes of developing a common subgrant application, conducting joint application workshops, and reviewing consolidated applications. Once states have had an opportunity to learn from their experience, they may eventually include more federally funded programs in a consolidated process. In 1996-97, as one Eisenhower Professional Development respondent explained, consolidating local applications was a work in progress:

> The consolidated application process allows an opportunity to hold workshops together and discuss how applications are the same across the [programs]. We are getting a chance to see the connections.

Expected effects of local consolidated plans. State administrators were cautiously optimistic about the effects of the consolidation of local planning. In response to an open-ended question asking them to elaborate on the ways in which local flexibility had increased, several state administrators reported that many local project administrators were still working within the boundaries of their categorical programs and resisted efforts to coordinate program services and activities. Not unlike themselves a few years ago, many state administrators (mostly Title I) warned that it would take some time before local administrators were comfortable collaborating with other programs:

> We're trying to figure out how to get people to work in teams to do the plan, not just passing the application around where each person fills out their own program. (Title I)

> It's hard to change practices and attitudes...it's a whole new concept of broadening a vision and seeing connections between programs. It will take a lot of technical assistance to understand the concept. (Even Start)

> When you consolidate Title II, IV, and VI, LEAs think that's a way to do away with jobs at the local level. It's difficult for some to have enough trust to let go of program-specific responsibilities and agree to collaborate. It's hard to go beyond personal needs and see what's good for schools. (Title I)

> The greatest barrier to implementing the reauthorized law is turfism on the part of LEAs that are reluctant to change. They say, 'It's always been that way' and 'I'm federal, I can't do that' in response to anything that is new. (Title I)

---

[6] With the exception of the administrators for the Homeless and Even Start programs, over half the survey respondents reported that requiring or accepting consolidated applications or conducting joint application workshops represented a change from what their programs had done in the past.

> Getting local directors to give up their power [is the most difficult thing to do]. They are used to controlling programs, and as a result, find it difficult to share decisionmaking powers with other participants. (Title I)

It is interesting, by the way, to observe the focus of these state administrators on process: they said much more about the extent to which programs could work together than about what they were working toward, such as ensuring that all children meet challenging standards.

Waivers of Statutory or Regulatory Requirements

The federal policy behind the Goals 2000 and IASA legislation held that program requirements should not stand in the way of effective educational services. If a legal provision might prevent a district or school from using an effective program design, ED wanted the district to ask for a waiver of that provision. In states not participating in Ed-Flex, the procedure was for the district to communicate with its SEA, which would then forward the waiver request to ED. An SEA could also request a statewide waiver--one that, if granted, would apply to all districts in the state. In the Ed-Flex states, the SEA had the authority to grant waivers for districts.

The ESEA and Homeless programs included in this study could have their provisions waived through these procedures. Thus, we asked the program administrators in the non-Ed-Flex states about their communications with districts about waivers and their expectations for future waiver activity.

In contrast to other aspects of program administration like state and local program plans, which were part of the lives of virtually all the program administrators, waivers were the responsibility of a smaller proportion of administrators. Excluding the Ed-Flex states, a total of 320 state administrators participated in the survey. When asked, 23 percent of them said that waiver requests did not come to their office but went to another office in the SEA. This left 246 respondents to the questions about communications with districts and schools; by program, the numbers ranged from 36 in Title I down to 25 in Education for Homeless Children and Youth.

A caveat is important here: this survey enables us to describe the activity and perceptions concerning ED waivers in only the offices that administer the eight programs included in this study. As the following discussion shows, the level of activity was quite limited. This may not fully reflect state activity around waivers; it is possible that in some SEAs, offices that did not participate in this survey were more actively communicating with school districts about the waiver authority. However, our data do

answer a specific question: to what extent has the waiver authority entered the conversation between state administrators of ESEA and Homeless programs and district-level staff?

Communications with Districts about the Waiver Authority

Of these state coordinators who had some responsibility in connection with waivers, most coordinators in every program except Education for Homeless Children and Youth had addressed the subject of waivers in statewide or regional meetings, and most had forwarded copies of ED's waiver guidance to local districts (Table 5). Fewer than one-fourth had sent out written information about waivers developed by the state (probably indicating that states have not developed such documents). Coordinators of Education for Homeless Children and Youth stood out for their especially limited communication about the waiver authority: only about one-third of respondents said they had relayed any information about it.

Title I administrators were the most active in their communications about waivers. Title I was the only program with a majority of administrators who reported that they both forwarded copies of ED's waiver guidance and provided technical assistance to districts in the process of preparing waiver requests.

The content of the guidance that districts received from state administrators of federal programs usually included information about the format for waiver requests (Table 6). Less often, it addressed the use of waivers to improve the quality of instruction or to improve student performance. Most administrators outside Title I, however, answered the question about their own guidance by saying that no districts were considering the waiver option. Among coordinators of Education for Homeless Children and Youth, this was the universal response to the question.

Although the survey yielded fairly limited elaborations on administrators' responses to the waiver questions, one explanation for why program administrators failed to promote the waiver option among districts may be that they simply did not believe there was much need for waivers among local districts:

> We distributed the information [about waivers] as required by law, but we haven't seen the need for waivers, and [the districts] haven't asked. (Title I)
>
> We have informed local districts about the waiver authority at statewide/regional meetings, but we tell them to do it [apply for waivers] at their own risk. We're not encouraging [waivers]; why write rules if you don't want them followed? (Title VI)

Table 5

Ways State Offices Have Informed Local Districts and Schools about the Waiver Authority in the New Law, by Program (N=246)[1]

How has your office informed local districts and schools about the waiver authority in the new law?					
	Number of State Administrators Who:				
Federally Funded Education Programs	Forward Copies of ED's Waiver Guidance	Send Out Written Information Developed By the State	Address the Subject at Statewide or Regional Meetings	Provide TA to Districts Preparing Waiver Requests	Inform Districts By Other Means
Title I, Part A (N=36)	31	8	32	27	6
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=29)	15	3	17	2	4
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=33)	18	8	20	4	5
Title VI (N=33)	19	6	21	4	4
Education of Migratory Children (N=28)	15	7	17	7	1
Even Start Family Literacy (N=32)	13	2	17	3	1
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=30)	21	3	19	8	1
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=25)	8	1	9	2	1
TOTAL	140	38	152	57	2

Table reads: Thirty-one state directors of Title I, Part A reported that their office informs local districts and schools about the waiver authority in the new law by forwarding to districts copies of ED's waiver guidance.

[1] Respondents (1) run programs for which waivers can be received from ED and (2) said they are the point person for district waiver requests pertaining to the program(s) the respondent administers. N=246.

Table 6

Kinds of Guidance State Administrators Report Their Office Distributes to Districts Considering Submitting a Waiver Request, by Program (N=246)[1]

What kinds of guidance or suggestions, if any, does this office distribute to districts that are considering submitting a waiver request?						
	Number of State Administrators Who Distribute to Districts Guidance on:					
Federally Funded Education Programs	Format	Using Waiver to Improve the Quality of Instructions	Using Waivers to Help Coordinate Their Program's Funding with State Reform Efforts	Using Waivers to Improve Student Performance	Nothing	Not Applicable; No Districts Considering Waiver Requests
Title I, Part A (N=50)	38	46	18	20	6	1
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	7	23	8	5	15	7
Goals 2000 (N=44)	14	22	14	10	18	7
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	9	19	5	5	12	7
Title VI (N=50)	9	13	3	5	16	8
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	19	25	19	15	20	2
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	12	20	8	11	19	9
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	14	24	8	7	11	6
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	8	14	9	6	14	11

Table reads: Thirty-eight state directors of Title I, Part A reported that their office distributes guidance or suggestions on the format of waiver requests to districts that are considering submitting a waiver request.

[1] Respondents (1) run programs for which waivers can be received from ED and (2) said they are the point person for district waiver requests pertaining to the program(s) the respondent administers. N=246.

Administrators' Expectations for Waiver Activity

Across roughly ten thousand districts that might submit waivers in one or more of these eight ESEA programs, state administrators expected the next year's waiver requests to number only in the hundreds.[7] Almost three-fourths of the eligible survey respondents (73 percent) estimated that their office will forward no district waiver requests to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) over the next 12 months. Only 20 percent of respondents estimated that they would receive any local-level waiver requests, and most of these believed they would receive no more than one, two, or three requests in the next year (Table 7). Compared with other program administrators who said they expected to receive waiver requests, Title I administrators estimated they would receive the most, with 169. Eisenhower Professional Development administrators ran a distant second, estimating they would receive 71 waiver requests.

Reviews of State Laws and Regulations as Barriers to Education Reform

Despite the relatively sparse use of the waiver authority, most states were reviewing their own laws or regulations that might impede local reform. In all but two states, at least one program administrator knew about such a review; the great majority of Goals 2000 administrators (38 out of 44) reported that their states were reviewing state laws and regulations. However, these efforts often lacked visibility among the administrators of other federal programs. Responding to the same question, only 41 percent of administrators of ESEA programs said they knew their state had plans to review state laws and regulations that might act as barriers to local reform. Responses to this question suggest that many state administrators of federal programs might have been unaware of their states' broader reform activities.

Summary: The Status of "Flexibility"

In the name of flexibility, most state program administrators had to do more than one of the following new tasks: work with a wider range of colleagues, perhaps for the first time, to develop a new kind of plan; account for administrative time in a different way; develop a new application format

---

[7] Since late 1996 and early 1997 when the data were collected for this study, the U.S. Department of Education has distributed guidance and provided much technical assistance on waivers and other flexibility, and the number of waiver requests received by the Department is fairly large in number (Memo, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Department of Education, January 1998).

Table 7

Number of Waiver Requests from Local Districts State Administrators Expect Their Office Will Forward to the U.S. Department of Education over the Next 12 Months
(N=246)[1]

About how many waiver requests from local districts would you estimate this office will forward to ED over the next 12 months?	
Expected Number of Local Waiver Requests That Will Be Forwarded to USED	**Number of State Administrators**
None	180
One	10
Two	10
Three	9
Four	3
Five	3
6 - 10	7
11 - 15	3
16 - 20	1
More Than 20	3
Don't Know	13
Not Applicable	4

Table reads: One hundred and eighty state administrators reported that they did not expect that their office would forward any waiver requests from local districts to the U.S. Department of Education in the next 12 months.

[1] Respondents (1) run programs for which waivers can be received from ED and (2) said they are the point person for district waiver requests pertaining to the program(s) the respondent administers. N=246.

and explain it in workshops conducted with colleagues; communicate with local districts about the waiver option; and (as we will discuss in the next chapter) begin to learn how to monitor across programs. All in all, it is perhaps surprising that the early stages of implementing these new laws left as many as 38 percent of state ESEA program managers with a sense of increased administrative flexibility.

We found some tendency for the provisions discussed in this chapter to be implemented in clusters. For example, programs that consolidated their administrative funds were more likely to require consolidated subgrant applications from local school districts. One result was a sense of overload for the administrators affected. A Title I coordinator's comments captured the level of frenzy many administrators described in their efforts to respond not to state standards, but to IASA:

> The reauthorization basically led to too much new work--we must build a new application procedure and assessment system, create a network of distinguished educators, schools now have to do plans, and Title I Directors' roles are changing. And there is ongoing interpretation at the federal level regarding how to implement the new legislation.

Although half of the state administrators of the programs included in this study thought that local educators were experiencing greater flexibility, they also observed some difficulties in coping with the new program provisions at the local level. In particular, they commented that traditional program boundaries were impeding local cross-program planning--and few even spoke of any local progress in moving beyond planning to actual service delivery.

Finally, very few administrators referred to a key principle of the reauthorization: that states or districts had received new flexibility in exchange for a different kind of accountability. This omission may well reflect the thinness of current arrangements for performance-based accountability, which we discuss next.

III. Accountability: To What Extent Are States Using Performance Data to Inform Their Efforts?

IASA, the federal legislation amending ESEA and the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, includes provisions that connect program accountability to state systems of challenging content and performance standards. According to ED's cross-cutting guidance, the idea behind this mandate was to "[1] improve coordination of federal programs with state reforms, and [2] instill in federal programs a culture of accountability and continual improvement" (p.9; USED, 1996). As a result of IASA amendments, advocates hoped that the accountability mechanisms would direct educators' and program administrators' attention to the challenge of bringing all students to high standards--and, further, that the magnitude of this challenge could stimulate big changes in program services. For the legislation to fulfill this hope, however, several structures and processes would have to be in place. Not only would states need ways of measuring student achievement, they would also need to lead districts and schools in the use of data to stimulate and guide improvements in program services.

This survey explored the extent to which state administrators of the nine programs included in this study were using a variety of accountability tools--including student performance data as measured by state assessments, program performance indicators, and program monitoring systems--to press vigorously for improving student performance.

Accountability as a Force Shaping Federal Program Services

At this point in implementing the law, few state program administrators were anticipating significant changes to the operations and administration of their programs in response to state assessments.

Relatively simple administrative steps, such as offering technical assistance or encouraging local professional development on the subject of student assessment, varied in their frequency across programs: they were very widespread in Title I, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Goals 2000; they were less common in Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities and Education for Homeless Children and Youth (Table 8).

Much more rare was a view of assessment results as a major influence on program operations. The following quotation was an unusually strong statement about the effect of state assessment on federal program operations:

Table 8

State Administrators Who Offer Technical Assistance or Encourage Local Professional Development on the Subject of Student Assessment (N=436)

In the past year, has your office funded or directly provided technical assistance to subgrantees on student assessment?

In written communications--or in workshops, monitoring, or other interactions--did you encourage subgrantees to focus on student assessment in their professional development?

	Number of State Administrators Who:	
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Fund or Directly Provide Subgrantees Technical Assistance on Student Assessment**	**Encourage Subgrantees to Focus Their Professional Development on Student Assessment**
Title I, Part A (N=50)	41	44
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	14	19
Goals 2000 (N=44)	31	35
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	37	32
Title VI (N=50)	24	25
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	31	35
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	29	30
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	32	32
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	13	20

Table reads: Forty-one state directors of Title I, Part A reported that their office funds or directly provides technical assistance to subgrantees on student assessment.

Forty-four state directors of Title I, Part A reported that their office encourages subgrantees to focus their professional development on student assessment.

> Title I is supporting all kinds of initiatives [e.g., Reading Recovery] to support performance to standards. Schools that think they're doing a good job will have a real come-uppance when the bar for achievement is raised with the notion that all students will succeed at a high level. [and federal programs will have to do more]. (Title I)

An administrator in another state, who would have liked to use assessment to drive improvements in services, expressed frustration with the assessments in use there:

> [There is no way of] really looking at student work and making judgments about student progress [under the current system of assessment]. We need to really push [the idea that] *all* students can succeed. (Title I)

This state administrator was almost unique, however, in articulating a gap between what state assessment might do and what it was currently capable of doing. Much more commonly, student performance was not a focus of specific procedural concern for program administrators, although they might mention it as a program aim.

At the time of this survey, just over two years into the implementation of IASA, the goal of using state assessment as a lever for improving coordination of federal programs with state reforms was clearly not yet realized. It was difficult to judge to what extent new assessments aligned with standards might come to affect the services and activities of federally funded programs.

Uses of Data in SEA Program Management

The goal of instilling a culture of accountability and continual improvement among those administering federally funded programs is, as yet, unmet. One can imagine many ways in which SEA program managers could lead the way toward the use of data for continuous educational improvement. They could organize their own work--and set an example for local educators--by using student data as a source of information about what is going well or poorly. Similarly, they could adopt and use systems of performance indicators for their programs' work. Our investigation of their uses of data, however, suggests that in 1996-97, the available data were going largely unused at the state level--or, at least, their purposes had little to do with judging the success of federally funded programs in raising student achievement.

Student Performance Data

Almost all state administrators of federal programs, 91 percent, said they received (or expected to receive soon) data on student performance. In addition, most state administrators said they used student performance data for some combination of purposes. The most common purpose was for the identification of schools that need help--something that was required in Title I. Identifying schools for recognition was also common in Title I, where it will become a required process as final assessment systems are phased in, and not uncommon in Migrant Education (19 out of 47 administrators of Migrant Education). Some administrators, about 15 percent, acknowledged that they did not use the data for any purpose (Table 9). This was most common among administrators of Title VI and Eisenhower Professional Development--programs in which students are seldom direct recipients of services.

Although most state administrators reported making some use of data on student performance, their answers to other questions showed that such data did not necessarily factor into their assessments of overall program quality. When we asked respondents how they judged the success of their work, most cited feedback from subgrantees, their own observations, and other anecdotal information. Very few described their successes and failures in terms of student achievement. The following comment was typical:

> Schoolwide programs are working well. It gives [schools] more flexibility, less paperwork, all students benefit. We know this from feedback from the districts, informal conversations. [We have received] no negative responses [about schoolwides] in any way. (Title I)

Very few state program administrators reported any systematic way of evaluating the success of their program; almost none referred to student performance data. Even Start state coordinators were the only exception to this finding. As the following descriptions suggest, however, Even Start program quality is judged mostly on process and inputs as opposed to student outcomes:

> Even Start collects data because the state measures individual program success by growth in the number of families served and the number of participants meeting their own goals.

> We do pay some attention to adult GEDs and test scores, but most of our criteria are based on projects' own criteria and on process data, such as number of families served, and how well the project can identify "challenge areas" that they need to improve upon.

Table 9

Purposes for Which State Program Offices Use Student Performance Data, by Program (N = 392)[1]

How has this office used the data that you have received concerning student performance?	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Their Office Uses Data on Student Performance for:					
Federally Funded Education Programs	Identifying Schools for Recognition	Identifying Schools That Need Help	Sending Reports to Districts	Sending Reports to Technical Assistance Providers	Other Purposes	No Purpose
Title I, Part A (N = 50)	38	46	18	20	6	1
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N = 50)	7	23	8	5	15	7
Goals 2000 (N = 44)	14	22	14	10	18	7
Eisenhower Professional Development (N = 50)	9	19	5	5	12	7
Title VI (N = 50)	9	13	3	5	16	8
Education of Migratory Children (N = 47)	19	25	19	15	20	2
Even Start Family Literacy (N = 49)	12	20	8	11	19	9
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N = 48)	14	24	8	7	11	6
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N = 48)	8	14	9	6	14	11
TOTAL	130	206	92	84	131	58

Table reads: Thirty-eight state directors of Title I, Part A reported that their office uses the data that it receives on student performance for identifying schools for recognition.

[1] 44 respondents reported that they did not receive data on student performance or that the survey question pertaining to the use of student performance data was not applicable. N = 392.

A few administrators' comments highlight the difficulty and confusion administrators feel about the prospect of linking program success to student achievement:

> Trying to come up with an evaluation that shows what federal dollars can accomplish in the area of student achievement is difficult...[there are so many variables] and so few dollars". (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities)

> We can implement programs, or we can analyze and evaluate them, but we can't do both! (Eisenhower Professional Development)

Finally, with the exception of state Title I Directors, less than 20 percent of survey respondents said they used the data in ways that might help focus attention on student performance and thereby improve program quality, such as sending student performance reports to districts (19 percent) or to technical assistance providers (17 percent). At the same time, however, 53 percent of all state administrators said they funded or directly provided technical assistance to subgrantees on the use of data-driven decisionmaking.

Program Performance Indicators

Program performance indicators were not a particularly common means by which program administrators assessed and improved program success. They were found in slight majorities of the state offices administering Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities and Even Start, but in only about one-fifth of the offices administering Title VI and Neglected or Delinquent (Table 10). In most of the other programs, about 40 percent of managers said their offices had developed program performance indicators. Of these, a sizable majority--77 percent--said they had done so because of federal requirements (Table 11).

Despite their infrequent use, program performance indicators seemed to hold value among those state program administrators who did report using them. As Table 12 shows, 92 percent of the respondents who reported having developed performance indicators said that performance indicators helped their work to some extent or a great extent.

Table 10

State Administrators Reporting That Their Office Has Developed Program Performance Indicators, by Program (N=436)

Has this office developed program performance indicators?	
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Number of State Administrators**
Title I, Part A (N=50)	21
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	34
Goals 2000 (N=44)	19
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	22
Title VI (N=50)	12
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	22
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	27
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	9
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	12
TOTAL	178

Table reads: Twenty-one state directors of Title I, Part A reported that their office has developed program performance indicators.

Table 11

Factors That Influenced the Development of Program Performance Indicators, by Program (N=178)[1]

What factor(s) influenced the development of program performance indicators?			
	Number of State Administrators Reporting the Following Influences on the Development of Program Performance Indicators:		
Federally Funded Education Programs	Federal Program Requirements	State Requirements	Other
Title I, Part A (N=21)	18	12	5
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=34)	28	12	10
Goals 2000 (N=19)	9	12	7
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=22)	20	6	8
Title VI (N=12)	10	5	2
Education of Migratory Children (N=22)	17	14	6
Even Start Family Literacy (N=27)	18	9	18
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=9)	9	6	0
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=12)	8	5	7
TOTAL	137	81	63

Table reads: Eighteen state directors of Title I, Part A reported that federal program requirements influenced the development of their program performance indicators.

[1] This number includes just those respondents reporting that their office has developed program performance indicators.

Table 12

Extent to Which Implementing Program Performance Indicators Has Helped State Administrators' Work, by Program (N=178)[1]

To what extent will implementing performance indicators help your work?				
	Number of State Administrators Reporting That Implementing Program Performance Indicators Has:			
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Helped Their Work to a Great Extent**	**Helped Their Work to Some Extent**	**Helped Their Work Very Little**	**Not Been Helpful**
Title I, Part A (N=21)	16	5	0	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=34)	15	16	0	0
Goals 2000 (N=19)	16	3	0	0
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=22)	7	11	2	2
Title VI (N=12)	3	7	1	0
Education of Migratory Children (N=22)	9	10	2	0
Even Start Family Literacy (N=27)	18	9	0	0
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=9)	4	3	1	0
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=12)	7	5	0	0
TOTAL	95	69	6	2

Table reads: Sixteen state directors of Title I, Part A reported that implementing program performance indicators has helped their work to a great extent.

[1] This number includes just those respondents reporting that their office has developed program performance indicators.

The program in which administrators gave the lowest ratings to performance indicators was Eisenhower Professional Development, in which such indicators have been the subject of discussion at several national meetings. The reason for this finding may be that the relatively high level of activity around indicators in the Eisenhower Professional Development program has brought philosophical disagreements to the forefront. Whatever the reason, a few of these administrators did register their dissatisfaction with the indicators and reporting forms that had been circulated:

> The federal government has not adapted its own procedures to the new concepts of using Title II funds. The reporting forms are focused on body counts and activities rather than on what you are really trying to do. Also, they don't differentiate what is Title II money and what is state and local money.

> The law pushes for coordination of programs and a coordinated plan and then turns around and asks for program-specific evaluations on each individual programs.... We should have coordinated evaluation that covers all programs.

Monitoring

One way for state program offices to maintain a climate of accountability is by monitoring local school districts' programs. In the 1970s and 1980s, monitoring was a vehicle for communicating the importance of program requirements. Under the new philosophy embodied in IASA and Goals 2000, in which specific requirements take a back seat to the pursuit of more effective teaching and learning, monitoring could theoretically be retooled to provide a rigorous focus on program effectiveness and states' educational priorities. At the time of the survey, state program administrators generally did report that program effectiveness had become the focus for monitoring. However, there is reason to doubt that this focus was being effectively communicated to most districts in view of changes in the frequency and targeting of monitoring, as we discuss below.

Monitoring as Technical Assistance

The purpose of monitoring has changed fast. Numerous state administrators replied to the survey questions about monitoring with some variant of the following statement: "We don't do monitoring anymore. We provide assistance to districts to improve program quality." The collective disdain for "compliance" monitoring was clear; to some, compliance monitoring had, in the past, offered districts no assistance at all:

...monitoring used to be 100 percent program compliance based on a routine cycle with identical procedures for all sites. Now, program effectiveness is key. (Title I)

Program monitoring has changed in our state to program effectiveness instead of compliance. We're looking broadly at the educational system of a district. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

We have replaced a 101 item checklist with a much more simple format. Now we're really here to help the program as opposed to actually monitoring them. (Title I)

Beyond fairly general assertions, however, it was less clear what kinds of technical assistance SEAs were actually offering as part of monitoring. When program administrators were asked to identify the strengths and weaknesses of their monitoring systems, none described monitoring as an opportunity to tell subgrantees how they might use program resources to support standards-based reform. Most discussed monitoring strengths and weaknesses in terms of staffing: the strength was having enough staff to conduct monitoring visits; the weakness was *not* having enough staff to conduct monitoring visits.

Frequency of Monitoring

With downsizing of state administrative staffs, monitoring visits have become infrequent. The majority of respondents for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Eisenhower Professional Development, Title VI, and Neglected or Delinquent say that fewer than one-fourth of their subgrantees received monitoring visits in the past 12 months (Table 13). More seriously, about one-quarter of the respondents for Eisenhower Professional Development, Title VI, and Neglected or Delinquent reported that no subgrantees had received monitoring visits in the past 12 months. In addition, although most program administrators reported that their monitoring systems have a "routine cycle," that did not necessarily mean that their subgrantees received visits. For example, many states cited resorting to a desk audit and only visiting subgrantees when requested or when a problem was identified. For example, in one midwestern state, several administrators complained that limited staff and resources had forced them to monitor by assessing written reports (e.g., applications, quarterly financial reports, and internal audits) rather than through actual visits to sites. Other administrators reported having made similar arrangements:

Table 13

Project Monitoring: Proportion of Program Subgrantees Receiving Monitoring Visits in the Past 12 Months, by Program (N=436)

In the past 12 months, about what proportion of [this program's] subgrantees received monitoring visits?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators Who Report the Following Proportions of Subgrantees Receiving Monitoring Visits: Half or More	Between ¼ and ½	Fewer than ¼	None
Title I, Part A (N=50)	7	20	16	7
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	4	15	25	6
Goals 2000 (N=44)	16	6	12	9
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	5	14	17	14
Title VI (N=50)	6	16	17	11
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	28	7	5	5
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	38	7	2	2
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	11	8	12	15
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	32	8	3	4
TOTAL	147	101	109	73

Table reads: Seven state directors of Title I, Part A reported that about half or more of their program's subgrantees received monitoring visits in the past 12 months.

The process of orchestrating administrative changes has meant that there is very little time available for monitoring. In the past year, monitoring has been triggered by audit findings or complaints. (Title I)

Monitoring consists of a desk review of LEA/subgrantee information; if the information is of concern or if a subgrantee requests a visit, then monitors will visit the site. (Even Start)

Still other programs--and some states--might have had a set monitoring cycle but have put it on hold: (1) as a result of efforts to coordinate and collaborate; (2) while organizing a change to a new, perhaps integrated monitoring system; or (3) until the program had more staff available to conduct monitoring visits:

Most project staff are spending their time talking within the SEA and with LEAs about consolidation and trying to make program distinctions invisible; consolidation is tough to do. As a result, however, there's not enough staff to do on-site monitoring. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

There was a hiatus in project monitoring in 1995 and we are currently trying to decide whether to do on-site monitoring in the future. The high costs [of monitoring] have forced a re-examination of future monitoring. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

- One southern state is switching to integrated monitoring visits. During this transition period, many programs were not monitored. In a mid-western state, monitoring visits have been all but suspended for most programs due to reduced staff size, reduced funding, and the belief that the federal legislation places a higher priority on other areas such as technical assistance.

Targeting of Monitoring

Rather than focusing on districts that might be out of compliance or where student performance was low, state program managers seemed just as likely to go to the districts that invited them in. For example, only 36 percent of respondents said monitoring visits were triggered by information suggesting that the grantee was having trouble meeting program requirements (Table 14). Among the 34 percent of respondents who selected "other" when asked on what basis they decide which grantees to visit, many explained that monitoring visits were often triggered at the request of the grantees.
Moreover, many respondents said that the information they received about a grantee "in trouble" was usually provided by the grantee itself through telephone conversations:

Table 14

Project Monitoring: Reasons Why State Administrators Visit Subgrantees, by Program
(N=436)

On what basis is it decided which subgrantees to visit?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators Who Report That: There is a Routine Cycle for Monitoring Visits	Monitoring Visits Are Triggered by Information That Grantees Are Having Trouble Meeting Program Requirements	Monitoring Visits Are Triggered by Information about Student Performance	Other
Title I, Part A (N=50)	30	24	13	18
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	32	26	5	17
Goals 2000 (N=44)	21	14	6	17
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	27	17	8	19
Title VI (N=50)	34	19	8	15
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	32	15	4	17
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	35	17	5	12
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	32	11	4	14
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	30	13	2	20
TOTAL	273	156	55	149

Table reads: Thirty state directors of Title I, Part A reported that their program has a routine cycle for monitoring visits.

> Localities feel they are able to do what is required and that [the SEA] trusts them to do it; yet they know that we're here to help and are not out to get them. They let us know when they have needs. (Title VI)
>
> Our monitoring is technical assistance; they identify their needs and we respond. (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities)

The directors of a few programs identified some problems with a highly selective approach to monitoring:

> The problem with this new procedure is that by only visiting projects that have problems or request assistance, there's no way to look across the state to determine common technical assistance or professional development needs. I've seen programs that run properly, but have severe weaknesses. Although they're in compliance, they're not doing enough. (Migrant Education)
>
> Because of the reduced focus on compliance, sometimes compliance issues get overlooked. (Even Start)

State program administrators' reports on the targeting of monitoring are bad news for those who promote a data-driven approach to program management. Very few program managers (13 percent) reported that monitoring visits were triggered by information about student performance. The percentage was twice as high in the Title I program, but it still represented only 13 of 50 administrators in Title I.

Integrated Monitoring Visits

Monitoring visits in which a team of state program administrators collectively addresses the needs of several federal and state programs could present a good opportunity for states to give districts a coherent, coordinated message about the use of program resources to support standards-based reform. In addition, sharing the burden of monitoring among federal and state program staff might make monitoring visits more affordable and thereby more likely to occur.

Integrated monitoring visits appeared to be the coming trend among federally funded programs; already, about 27 states conducted some form of integrated monitoring visits. Moreover, four of these states--Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, and Wyoming--had attached their integrated monitoring visits for federal programs to their state accreditation process. Among federal programs, integrated monitoring visits were especially common across Title I, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Title VI (Table 15). Judging from the comments of several program administrators, particularly among directors of these four programs, most have responded positively to their state's move to integrated monitoring visits:

> ...it's nice to have the collegiality; it strengthened us as a team. Also, with more eyes, you get a better picture of grantees. (Title I)
>
> I think it's a good idea; it's allowing us to learn about all the other programs by being on site. We're seeing how they can fit together. (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities)
>
> Although the visits are less in-depth, they are more fair, thorough, and consistent--the same actions [across programs] generate the same responses [from the integrated monitoring team]. (Title I)

As evidence of the growing acceptance of integrated monitoring visits, nine Title I directors report that their states are planning to do integrated monitoring visits sometime in the near future.

Among the more strategic approaches being developed is Mississippi's integrated monitoring system (see Figure 1). Other states, too--including California, South Carolina, Virginia, and Texas--had centralized their monitoring operations in offices separate from federal programs. As the discussion in Figure 1 suggests, such systems are not perfect and there are real tradeoffs to be made between raising program quality and equitably distributing the services of experienced technical assistance providers among local sites.

At the time of the survey, integrated monitoring visits were not resulting in the kinds of efficiencies that would translate into visiting more sites. Instead, the survey data showed that the programs participating in integrated monitoring visits were generally visiting fewer subgrantees.

In addition, program administrators suggested that this method of monitoring, while generally accepted, does have its drawbacks. Among the concerns administrators raised about integrated monitoring visits were that: (1) they would be unable to collect the kind of program-specific information they need to determine whether programs were operating within the law; (2) the integrated monitoring teams would overwhelm small districts where one person may administer several programs; and (3) team members would lack the expertise to help individual programs:

> [Integrated] monitoring has meant that you don't get as specific about a program, so sometimes you lose information; the information is there, but there's no way to monitor it...we don't do any monitoring as well as we used to when we focused on individual programs. (Migrant Education)

Table 15

State Administrators Reporting That Their State Conducts Integrated Monitoring Visits, by Program (N=436)

Has this state conducted any integrated monitoring visits that address [this program] and also other federal or state programs?	
Federally Funded Education Programs	**Number of State Administrators**
Title I, Part A (N=50)	24
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	22
Goals 2000 (N=44)	14
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	26
Title VI (N=50)	26
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	16
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	19
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	16
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	16

Table reads: Twenty-four state directors of Title I, Part A reported that their state has conducted integrated monitoring visits that address their program and other federal or state programs.

Integrated monitoring will have less "precision. Everyone is becoming a generalist. It may be hard to keep programs strong because we no longer have specialists". (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities)

Figure 1
A Strategic Approach to Monitoring

Mississippi is in the process of changing its monitoring procedures from program-specific monitoring for every district to integrated monitoring only for those districts that rate poorly (level 1 or 2 out of 5) on the state's accreditation scale. For Level 1 districts (those in danger of a state takeover), the SEA has recently created a special office to provide technical assistance across all state and federal programs. This team is accompanied by federal program staff on monitoring and technical assistance visits. The federal programs staff will also begin doing integrated monitoring and technical assistance for Level 2 districts (those that are on probation). Districts rated levels 3-5 do not receive any visits, except in very special situations; instead, they receive only desk or telephone monitoring and technical assistance. One federal program administrator explained the motivation behind the change: "We didn't think we were being effective with low achieving districts. We wanted to help them use their federal dollars more effectively and help them align their programs."

A common complaint about the new monitoring process is that districts that score a 3, 4, or 5 on the accreditation scale are no longer part of a monitoring or technical assistance visiting cycle, even though they may still have program implementation problems that need to be addressed on site. According to the administrator of a program that offers discretionary grants, "Each project is so different, that if you don't visit, you really don't know what's going on.... Some projects may feel very alone out there, especially if they're new. I don't need to visit all of them, but I worry about several of them."

Although most respondents are nervous about leaving so many districts out of the monitoring and technical assistance visiting cycle, they are also generally positive about the new focus on intensive assistance to poor-performing districts. One administrator said, "The strength is that we don't just cite [them] and leave...we do technical assistance and try to help fix their problems right then. We'd rather help when possible." Although most respondents were positive about the new focus on poor-performing districts, those responsible for one program said that the special office created to work with Level 1 districts may not be effective for helping districts improve federal programs because "they aren't really federal program people with knowledge of the law. I don't think they are received as well as I would be because I have worked with this program for a long time."

As more and more states develop integrated monitoring systems, the fact that many do not include some of the smaller, discretionary grant programs (e.g., Even Start, Migrant Education, and Homeless Education) becomes an issue of concern. By excluding these programs, states may fail to send a coordinated, cohesive message to federal program subgrantees regarding standards-based reform.

Summary: Accountability Mechanisms in Place

This survey found most state administrators at a preliminary stage in using data to measure program results and in communicating to their districts the importance of accountability for student performance. Most could not yet look to state assessments aligned with content standards, even if they were disposed to use such assessments to point to areas of needed work--and many of them were not, judging by their limited use of performance indicators.

States had made progress in dismantling their old systems of monitoring for compliance with program provisions. They had far to go, however, in building new monitoring procedures that would send a clear message to districts about a new, standards-based accountability framework.

IV. Technical Assistance and Professional Development: Are States Working Strategically to Build Capacity?

According to ED, in order to ensure that all children meet high standards, the quality of teaching must be raised, and districts and schools "may need information and assistance" (USED, 1996) in order to raise it. Federal program administrators could try to influence efforts to raise the quality of teaching and learning by strategically allocating technical assistance resources to inform, support, and promote districts' efforts to move toward standards-based reform; and by encouraging local districts or other subgrantees to orient their professional development toward preparing teachers to teach to high standards.

In this chapter, we discuss the extent to which federal program offices in SEAs were bringing the full weight of their resources to bear on building local capacity to improve teaching in support of standards-based reform.

Technical Assistance

Agency downsizing in many SEAs had reduced the technical assistance capacity in federal programs, as the following administrators' comments revealed:

> Reductions in state funds and staff are the greatest problems in [program] implementation, which means we're providing less technical assistance to LEAs than in the late 80s and early 90s. I have a hard time meeting requests for technical assistance. (Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities)

> The lack of staffing prevents us from doing all we want to do. Fifty systems are being reviewed with three to five people on a team. In the past we sent larger teams. It's hard to provide technical assistance while on site for monitoring.... (Title VI)

With limited resources, state program administrators had to make difficult choices about where to provide assistance. However, rather than actively assessing local capacity to respond to the new legislation, many said they were relying on districts to know when they needed help and how to ask for it: 72 percent of all program managers gave technical assistance priority to districts that asked for help; 45 percent gave priority to those with program compliance problems; and only 37 percent gave priority to districts with low achievement (Table 16).

State program administrators also faced choices about the content to emphasize in their technical assistance, and they reported in the survey that standards-based content was not necessarily their first choice. "Meeting the needs of special populations" was the most frequently selected technical assistance topic across all programs, suggesting that technical assistance remained largely responsive to program-specific issues rather than to a cross-cutting agenda of standards, assessment, whole-school improvement, and data-driven decisionmaking (Table 17). The content of the assistance varied widely by program, however. Title I and Goals 2000 showed coordination in the content of the assistance they provided: more than two-thirds of the respondents for each of these programs said they provided or funded technical assistance in standards, assessment, whole-school improvement, and data-driven decisionmaking. Administrators of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Migrant Education, and Education for Homeless Children and Youth were less likely to offer help on standards, assessments, and data-driven decisionmaking[8]; they were much less likely to address whole-school improvement. Even Start also falls into this cluster of programs, but with one exception: 65 percent of the respondents for Even Start reported that their technical assistance focused on data-driven decisionmaking.

The methods by which state offices provided technical assistance in program development and operation did not vary much by program (Table 18). The most frequently cited methods of providing technical assistance were by: (1) distributing written guidance to all districts (89 percent); (2) offering periodic statewide meetings (85 percent); and (3) going to districts to provide assistance (84 percent). Some programs were reportedly more innovative and perhaps proactive than others in their methods of providing technical assistance. Title I, Even Start, Migrant Education, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities were above average in reporting that they made available to subgrantees the names and addresses of consultants and resource centers. In addition, Even Start posted the highest proportion of respondents who reported developing networks of local staff. The program of Education for Homeless Children and Youth had incorporated technology into its provision of technical assistance: most of the respondents reported providing technical assistance through electronic mail.

---

[8] Migrant Education was the exception to this finding with regard to assessment; in that program, about as many respondents as in Title I, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Goals 2000 reported that their technical assistance focused on assessment.

Table 16

Program Priorities for Allocating Technical Assistance Resources, by Program (N=436)

What are the priorities for allocating this program's technical assistance resources?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators Whose Program Priorities for Allocating Technical Assistance Include: Districts with Low Achievement	Districts with Less Experienced Program Managers	Districts That Request Help	High-Poverty Districts	Districts with Program Compliance Problems	Other
Title I, Part A (N=50)	36	30	39	34	30	10
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	7	21	41	15	32	14
Goals 2000 (N=44)	21	16	32	18	___	15
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	18	26	38	11	25	11
Title VI (N=50)	18	20	37	12	26	10
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	16	24	26	12	17	18
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	16	20	28	18	16	16
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	15	12	36	6	12	13
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	13	23	38	19	18	18
TOTAL	160	192	315	145	176	125

Table reads: Thirty-six state directors of Title I, Part A reported that their program priorities for allocating technical assistance resources included districts with low achievement.

Table 17

Technical Assistance Topics
States Fund or Directly Provide to Subgrantees, by Program
(N=436)

In the past year, has your office funded or directly provided technical assistance to subgrantees on any of the following topics?

Number and Percent of State Administrators Who Report Funding or Directly Providing Technical Assistance to Subgrantees on:

Federally Funded Education Programs	Content or Performance Standards	Student Assessment	Whole-School Improvement	Specific Academic Subjects	Meeting Needs of Special Populations	Adopting and Implementing Model Programs	Effective Roles for Instructional Aides	Techniques for Working with Families	Extended Instructional Time	Use of Data-Driven Decision Making	Other	No Particular Content Focus Encouraged
Title I, Part A (N=50)	39	41	47	33	38	30	17	43	32	41	9	2
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	12	14	22	4	28	29	1	30	6	28	17	3
Goals 2000 (N=44)	34	31	31	34	26	24	22	9	25	31	10	2
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	42	37	26	36	31	29	9	19	14	26	7	3
Title VI (N=50)	30	24	33	31	28	24	7	18	9	24	6	7
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	25	31	20	30	34	24	23	34	22	22	9	3
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	23	29	15	20	37	32	16	42	17	32	11	3
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	28	32	29	20	26	19	11	17	19	20	7	5
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	11	13	9	10	35	17	8	30	20	9	8	10
TOTAL	244	252	232	220	283	228	114	242	164	233	84	38

Table reads: Thirty-nine state directors of Title I, Part A reported that their office has funded or directly provided technical assistance to subgrantees on content and performance standards.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 18

Kinds of Technical Assistance Programs Provided to Assist Subgrantees in Program Development and Operations, by Program (N=436)

What kinds of technical assistance is your office providing to assist subgrantees in program development and operations?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators Who: Distribute Written Guidance to All Districts	Offer Periodic Statewide Meetings	Go to Districts to Provide Assistance	Provide Assistance through Electronic Mail	Offer Assistance through State Regional Service Centers	Make Available Names and Addresses of Consultants and Resource Centers	Developed Networks of Local Staff	Other
Title I, Part A (N=50)	47	45	46	25	27	40	28	10
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	45	45	43	24	23	34	26	10
Goals 2000 (N=44)	38	38	33	25	27	23	23	9
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	48	43	41	30	28	28	21	11
Title VI (N=50)	44	40	40	27	21	24	16	7
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	41	40	39	18	21	36	26	7
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	46	45	46	26	15	35	34	11
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	41	38	38	14	13	25	14	11
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	37	38	42	30	7	28	28	11
TOTAL	387	372	368	219	182	273	216	87

Table reads: Forty-seven state directors of Title I, Part A reported that their office distributes written guidance to all districts to assist them in program development and operations.

Professional Development

All of the federal programs included in this study can and do support professional development as a means of improving teaching and learning. In the enactment of Goals 2000 and IASA, the federal government has encouraged the strategic, coherent use of professional development to advance educational improvement. This study looked at state practices with regard to professional development under these programs, gathering data on the processes and the topics that SEA administrators encouraged their districts and other subgrantees to emphasize.

Processes Encouraged in Professional Development

State administrators reported that they were (1) attempting to improve efficiency in the provision of professional development across programs, and (2) encouraging certain procedures in professional development that are thought to make it more effective. The variation across programs, however, suggested that there was more work to be done to coordinate state-level efforts.

Pooling professional development funds. Virtually every state administrator of Title I and an overwhelming majority in Eisenhower Professional Development encouraged districts to pool funds for professional development across federal programs (Table 19). Overall, 72 percent of all administrators did so, but the percentage varied somewhat by program. The survey data suggest that there was some correlation between state-level efforts to coordinate and collaborate and whether program managers encouraged the pooling of professional development funds. For example, those administrators who reported joint application workshops were much more likely to encourage pooling of professional development funds. The reverse was also true: where separate subgrant applications were required (as they often were in the discretionary subgrant programs), pooling of funds was less likely to be encouraged.

Delving further into the issue of pooling funds, however, we find that SEA administrators within a state were not necessarily consistent in the messages they sent districts about pooling funds for professional development. In about 18 states, administrators' efforts to encourage their subgrantees to pool professional development funds with particular programs were not reciprocated by those programs' administrators--i.e., the other programs' administrators said they did not encourage their subgrantees to pool funds. In other states, administrators reported encouraging their subgrantees to pool funds with one program while that program's administrator encouraged his or her subgrantees to pool their resources with another program.

Table 19

Number of State Administrators Who Encouraged Subgrantees to Pool Their Program Funds for Professional Development With Those of Any Other Federal or State Programs, by Program (N=436)

Did any of your written or personal communications encourage subgrantees to pool [this program's] funds for professional development with those of any other federal or state program(s)?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators
Title I, Part A (N=50)	49
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	32
Goals 2000 (N=44)	31
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	43
Title VI (N=50)	37
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	30
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	36
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	30
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	26
TOTAL	314

Table reads: Forty-nine state directors of Title I, Part A reported that they encouraged, through written or personal communications, subgrantees to pool Title I funds for professional development with those of any other federal or state programs.

Title I was the program most often cited as a program with which other programs should pool their funds--almost certainly because its funding levels, being so much higher than those of other programs, presented an appealing target for program administrators. Other frequently cited programs were Eisenhower Professional Development, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, and Title VI. By comparison, the discretionary grants programs (Goals 2000, Migrant Education, Even Start, Neglected or Delinquent, and Education of Homeless Children and Youth) were rarely cited, even by other discretionary grants programs. For example, Even Start administrators most often cited Title I, followed by Adult Basic Education and Head Start; rarely did they mention Migrant Education or Education of Homeless Children and Youth. Among administrators of the Migrant Education Program, Title I was most often cited as a program with which to pool professional development resources, followed by state programs for bilingual education and English as a second language. Finally, administrators of the discretionary grants programs rarely cited programs known for their focus on professional development--Eisenhower Professional Development and Title VI.[9]

Approaches to professional development. State program administrators were promoting some approaches to professional development that were often described, both in the legislation and in policy discussions of professional development, as good ways of improving teaching and learning. "Sustained" professional development was a clear example: two-thirds of federal program managers reported that they were discouraging one-shot events in professional development (Table 20). Close to that same number said they encouraged professional development organized for teams of individuals from a particular school. As the following administrators' comments suggested, many credited the reauthorized legislation as prompting these changes in approach to professional development:

> The [legislative] requirement that [increases] building-level responsibility for planning and implementing Title II activities will strengthen the program all around. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

> We deemphasize the one-day workshop and encourage the intensive, sustained workshops...the new law promoted this change with its focus on long-term, sustained professional development. This language helped us push this concept on the districts. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

Despite the convergence around these two concepts in professional development, state program administrators were not entirely unanimous in their support for particular approaches in professional development. Indeed, approximately one-third of the administrators for Neglected or Delinquent, Title VI, and Education for Homeless Children and Youth said they were not encouraging their subgrantees

---

[9] Administrators for the N or D program were the only exception to this finding.

Table 20

Approaches to Professional Development That Subgrantees Are Encouraged to Use, by Program (N=436)

Did any of your written or personal communications encourage subgrantees to use particular approaches in providing professional development?

Federally Funded Education Programs	Number of State Administrators Who Encourage Subgrantees to Provide: Professional Development That Is Sustained over More Than a Single Event	Professional Development in Which Teams of Individuals from a Particular School Participate Together	Professional Development That Is Initiated by the School Building Rather Than the School District	Teacher or Administrator Networks (electronic or face to face)	Use of Technology, including Electronic Networks	Other	No Particular Approaches Encouraged
Title I, Part A (N=50)	42	41	40	23	24	3	6
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	33	34	19	19	18	6	11
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	42	31	39	26	29	6	7
Title VI (N=50)	28	23	24	18	21	4	21
Goals 2000 (N=44)	34	29	20	25	30	10	6
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	29	29	21	18	23	8	9
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	31	35	14	22	28	12	6
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	30	27	22	7	18	2	15
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	16	20	14	15	16	5	20
TOTAL	285	269	213	173	207	56	101

Table reads: Forty-two state directors of Title I, Part A reported that they encourage subgrantees, through written or personal communication, to provide professional development that is sustained over more than a single event.

to take particular approaches to professional development. In addition, few program managers reported encouraging approaches to professional development that would give greater control to teachers and schools. For example, only Title I and Eisenhower Professional Development had a majority of managers (40 and 39, respectively) who said they encouraged initiation of professional development by the school building rather than the school district. About half the state managers for Goals 2000, Title II, Even Start, and Title I said they encouraged subgrantees to use teacher or administrator networks (electronic and/or face-to-face). The following administrators' comments suggested that their reluctance to offer schools and teachers greater decisionmaking power with respect to professional development might be lodged in administrators' skepticism about teachers' capacity to make good choices:

> Our state has some distance to go in actually changing instructional strategies used in classrooms across the state. Many teachers are not very self-aware when it comes to using a variety of instructional strategies. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

> Getting schools to think of professional development in a more comprehensive way is a problem. For example, some schools send teachers to training on the use of graphing calculators, but do not have the funds/plans to supply graphing calculators to students. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

> The focus of professional development has changed. Before, a menu was used, which left too much room for discretion for teachers and others; now, a targeted approach is used. (Title I)

Despite some state administrators' pessimism about the capacity of schools and teachers to chart their own professional development courses, the survey data clearly showed that, at the state level, most federal program administrators were promoting at least some changes in approach to the provision of professional development. There was less evidence to suggest that administrators were as actively promoting change in the content of professional development, as we discuss next.

Content of Professional Development

With respect to the content of professional development, federal programs seemed more inclined to encourage a smorgasbord of topics rather than a tight focus. When given a list of 10 possible topics for professional development, many program managers reported that they were encouraging districts to "focus" on at least half of them (see Table 21). In addition, data analyses suggest that within any given state, there was little agreement among program administrators regarding the content of professional development. That is, the topics that Title I directors (for example)

Table 21

Topics on Which Subgrantees Are Encouraged[1] to Focus in Their Professional Development, by Program (N=436)

In written communications--or in workshops, monitoring, or other interactions--did you encourage subgrantees to focus on any of the following topics in their professional development?

	Number of State Administrators Who Encourage Their Subgrantees to Focus Professional Development on:											
Federally Funded Education Programs	Content or Performance Standards	Student Assessment	Whole-School Improvement	Specific Academic Subjects	Meeting Needs of Special Populations	Adopting and Implementing Model Programs	Effective Roles for Instructional Aides	Techniques for Working with Families	Extended Instructional Time	Use of Data-Driven Decision Making	Other	No Particular Topics Encouraged
Title I, Part A (N=50)	44	44	48	32	36	28	23	41	34	38	11	1
Safe and Drug-Free Schools (N=50)	18	19	25	5	31	21	1	25	7	33	18	5
Goals 2000 (N=44)	34	35	32	28	24	14	5	25	17	27	15	5
Eisenhower Professional Development (N=50)	39	32	31	41	33	27	8	19	9	23	4	7
Title VI (N=50)	24	25	31	26	28	20	7	17	11	21	10	15
Education of Migratory Children (N=47)	26	35	22	27	36	21	19	36	25	23	13	5
Even Start Family Literacy (N=49)	25	30	16	20	38	28	17	46	20	30	19	0
Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (N=48)	29	32	24	23	27	18	16	16	18	24	8	8
Education for Homeless Children and Youth (N=48)	18	20	14	12	34	20	11	31	22	13	6	11
TOTAL	257	272	243	214	287	197	107	256	163	232	104	57

Table reads: Forty-four state directors of Title I, Part A reported that they encouraged subgrantees, in written communications or in workshops, monitoring, or other interactions, to focus professional development on content or performance standards.

[1] In written communication or in workshops, monitoring, or other interactions.

encouraged their subgrantees to emphasize were often different from the topics the Even Start or Migrant Education managers encouraged.

When asked whether there were topics or approaches in professional development that their programs encouraged more actively in the past but have *deemphasized*, state administrators' responses again suggested that administrators' orientation to professional development focused more on changing the processes or structures through which professional development is delivered than on its content. Among the administrators of Title I and Eisenhower Professional Development who reported deemphasizing topics or approaches in professional development, changes in process outnumbered changes in content by a margin of two to one. Comments related to the demise of one-shot workshops were common. Other comments were analogous to the following:

> We're no longer sending teachers to national and local conferences without tying [what they learn] back to schools. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

> Before 1994, lots of our training was provided off-site. LEAs thought they were supposed to use professional development resources to send folks to conferences. Now, we focus more on site-based training, local curriculum alignment, study groups, and action research. (Eisenhower Professional Development)

Finally, many state program managers said they were coordinating their approach to professional development across programs. That is, among the 47 percent reporting a change from the past, most reported that professional development was becoming better coordinated among federal programs and that it was no longer an isolated, program-specific event:

> Our objectives for professional development are linked and programs can work together to provide [it]. (Title I)

> We encourage subgrantees to really tie in to overall local efforts--to tie in with other [federally funded] programs. (Title I)

> We have a unified approach [to professional development]; we're moving away from the categorical. (Education for Homeless Children and Youth)

> [Since the passage of IASA] we don't work in isolation anymore; there's more coordination of professional development funds and resources. (Education for Homeless Children and Youth)

In fact, many of the comments state administrators made about professional development were similarly enthusiastic about coordinating professional development but relatively vague about ways in which they were working together. This lack of specificity, coupled with their lack of topical focus, suggests that

program administrators had joined forces around a very broad professional agenda rather than a tightly defined one.

Summary: More Focus on Process than on Content

Programs varied a great deal in their attention to building local capacity around standards, assessment, or whole-school improvement; these topics were reportedly important in Title I but less so in other programs. Administrators were, however, learning to work together in technical assistance and professional development. Two other trends were clear: program administrators were beginning to subscribe to the value of pooling funds for professional development across categorical programs; and they were eager to eradicate the "one-shot workshop."

V. Conclusions

The policy vision of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act was one in which schools would strive for significant improvement in student performance, using all the resources at their disposal--including the resources they obtained under federal programs, many of which would continue to provide an extra boost for students at risk of failing to meet challenging standards. To help and encourage schools to make such a concerted effort, these laws emphasized the opportunities for school districts and state program administrators to break down program boundaries and to offer flexibility for local decisions.

At the early stage of program implementation investigated in this study, all state education agencies had made noticeable changes to their procedures in implementing the reauthorized programs. Consolidated plans were almost universal, and the planning process had helped inform administrators about each others' programs; in many cases, planning had also given them new ideas about ways to work together. This collaborative work was beginning to result in the acceptance of consolidated plans from local school districts and in integrated monitoring visits across programs. Both of these practices were being piloted in many states, although implementation was far from widespread.

There had also been some changes in the communication between SEAs and their districts. Clearly, SEAs were promoting and districts were using the option for schoolwide programs under Title I, and SEAs were generally encouraging districts to pool funds across programs to support professional development. At the other end of the spectrum, however, there was relatively little communication about waivers of program provisions. Some state administrators observed, too, that districts and schools had made slow progress in breaking down program barriers.

Thus, we conclude that SEAs had taken major steps toward cross-program communication in their own agencies at the time of the survey in late 1996 and early 1997, and that many program administrators had also communicated a message of broad program change to their districts. Effects were beginning to emerge, although they were not as large as some might wish.

Where implementation fell short of the original federal vision was in accountability for results. With the exception of following some mandated procedures--such as identifying Title I schools in need of improvement--most program administrators gave only limited evidence that they were attending to student performance. Having largely dismantled their old monitoring systems, few were sending a strong message to their districts that accountability for student performance would replace the compliance monitoring of the past. Instead, what was replacing compliance monitoring was technical assistance--primarily offered to

districts that knew when and how to ask for it. Ironically, too, the amount of work associated with making structural and procedural changes may have actually detracted from the attention program managers could give to the substance of educational reform. Administrators of federal programs continued to take many of their cues from the procedural provisions of federal legislation, which they understood to be telling them to learn about the purposes and procedures of other federal programs. The day-to-day work of most program administrators was not animated or organized by the idea of ensuring that students meet challenging standards.

This study provided baseline information on the early implementation of Goals 2000 and programs reauthorized under IASA. A follow-up implementation study in late summer and early fall 1998 has been designed to analyze the ways in which administrators of federally funded programs have continued to respond to the new legislative framework and the extent to which they have moved beyond attention to the procedural provisions of the legislation--such as consolidated planning and cross-program communication--and begun focusing on the task of aligning program services and operations with state content and performance standards so as to improve student achievement. Both the baseline and follow-up studies will help inform congressionally mandated evaluations of the impact of federal education programs and will provide data on the use of program performance indicators established pursuant to the Government Performance and Results Act.

Acknowledgments

Many people contributed to the planning, development, and review of this report. We wish to acknowledge their significant contributions here.

First, we thank the administrators in all 51 state education agencies (including the District of Columbia) who are responsible for each of nine federal programs (Title I, Part A; Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities; Goals 2000; Eisenhower Professional Development; Innovative Education Program Strategies; Education of Migratory Children; Even Start Family Literacy; Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk of Dropping Out; and Subtitle VII-B of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act) as well as to state research or evaluation specialists knowledgeable about assessment in the Title I program. We want to thank these individuals for generously giving us their time and their valuable insights into the operations of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the Improving America's Schools Act.

At the U.S. Department of Education, critiques and encouragement came from Joanne Bogart, Alan Ginsburg, Sue Ross, Stephanie Stullich and other staff in the Planning and Evaluation Service; Tom Fagan, Judith Johnson, William Lobosco, Grace Ross, Bayla White, and William Wooten in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education; Tom Corwin and Lonna Jones in the Budget Service; and Phil Rosenfelt and Kay Rigling in the Office of the General Counsel. We also want to express our thanks to members of the Independent Review Panel for the National Assessment of Title I; in particular, we'd like to thank Susan Fuhrman, Joseph Johnson, Phyllis McClure, and Linda Rodriguez for their comments and suggestions regarding the study instruments and the final report.

Members of the Policy Studies Associates staff, past and present, whose hard work and skill made this report possible were: John Breckenridge, Kelly Colopy, Keith Gayler, David Goldstein, Miriam Gonzales, Ben Lagueruela, Sara Nathanson, Eileen O'Brien, Ellen Pechman, Tom Spiggle, Kimberly Thomas, Karen Walking Eagle, and Jessica Wodatch.

APPENDIX

Survey Instruments

CORE SURVEY OF STATE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS

Standards and Assessment:

S1. [Interviewer: Precode whether this state has (or is developing) content or performance standards.]

a. Yes 1
b. No . . . . . 2 **GO TO F1**

S2. [Where content and performance standards have been/are being developed]: Have you personally participated in the development or review of the state's content and student performance standards (e.g., attended meetings, reviewed draft standards, etc.)?

a. Yes 1
b. No 2

S3. Have [this program's] funds helped support the development or review of the state's content and student performance standards?

a. Yes 1
b. No 2
c. Don't know 3

S4. [Where new assessments have been/are being developed or adopted]: Have [this program's] funds helped support the development or review of new assessments?

a. Yes (EXPLAIN) _____ 1
_____
_____
b. No 2
c. Don't know 3

S5. Can you give me examples of some ways in which [this program] is changing because of state content and student performance standards? [Probe for 2-3 examples]

State Plans:

F1. Did your office participate in the development of your state's consolidated ESEA plan in 1996?

a. Yes 1
b. No 2

F2. In what ways, if at all, do you think the consolidated plan differs from a plan that would have been developed separately for [this program]?

F3. In what ways, if at all, have you found that consolidated planning has affected the integration of [this program] with overall state policy in education or with other federal education programs?

F4. Do you think your state's Goals 2000 plan reflects your program's priorities and goals?

a. Yes 1
b. No 2
c. Not familiar with plan 3
d. PRECODE: State did not develop a Goals 2000 plan 4

Subgrant Applications:

L1. Does your program require or accept consolidated applications (that is, combined applications for more than one program) from districts? (CIRCLE ONE)

a. Consolidated applications are required 1
b. Consolidated applications are accepted but not required 2
c. No, this program requires a separate application 3
d. Other (SPECIFY) _____ . . . 4
_____
_____

L2. Are application workshops for subgrantees conducted jointly for [this program] and other programs? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Yes (SPECIFY PROGRAMS) _____	1	
b.	No, application workshops are not conducted for this program	2	
c.	No, application workshops focus only on this program	3	
d.	Other (SPECIFY) _____	4	___

L3. Do any of these procedures for subgrant applications [consolidated applications, workshop procedures] represent a change from what [this program] has done in the past?

a.	Yes (EXPLAIN) _____	1	
b.	No	2 GO TO M1	___

L4. What prompted the change(s)? [Probe for influence of state priorities, state funding, federal law or regulations, federal guidance or assistance, federal funding, professional trends, local educators]

L5. Among the influences identified, which would you identify as the major influence on changes to [this program's] subgrant application process?

Project Monitoring:

M1. In the past 12 months, about what proportion of [this program's] subgrantees received monitoring visits? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Half or more	1	___
b.	Between one-fourth and one-half	2	
c.	Fewer than one-fourth	3	
d.	None	4	

M2. On what basis is it decided which subgrantees to visit? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	There is a routine cycle for visits	1	___
b.	Visits are triggered by information suggesting that the grantee is having trouble meeting program requirements. (SPECIFY type and source of information): _____	1	___
c.	Visits are triggered by information about student performance. (SPECIFY type and source of information): _____	1	___
d.	Other (SPECIFY) _____	1	___

M3. Has this state conducted any integrated monitoring visits that address [this program] and also other federal or state programs?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY other program[s]) _____	1	
b.	No	2	___

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

M4. Which of the following program services associated with monitoring does your office provide? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Hiring staff who are experienced technical assistance providers so that they can provide on-site assistance rather than just collect information and then leave	1		___
b.	Providing professional development for program monitors [Duration of professional development: # of hours _____]	1	[___]	___
c.	Sending local subgrant projects questionnaires inquiring about their technical assistance needs	1		___
d.	Sending local subgrant projects advance information about the monitoring process	1		___
e.	Providing written feedback to local subgrant projects after the visit (GET A COPY OF THE FORMAT)	1		___
f.	Conducting follow-up visits (WHEN? e.g., how many months after initial visit) _____	1	[___]	___
g.	Other (SPECIFY) _____ _____ _____	1		___

M5. Do any of this office's procedures in program monitoring represent a change from what [this program] has done in the past?

a.	Yes (EXPLAIN) _____ _____ _____	1	
b.	No	2 GO TO P1	___

M6. What prompted this change? [Probe for influence of state priorities, state funding, federal law or regulations, federal guidance or assistance, federal monitoring, federal funding, professional trends, local educators]

M7. Among the influences identified, which would you identify as the major influence on changes to your program monitoring process?

M8. What do you personally believe are the strengths and weaknesses of your office's program monitoring process?

Building Capacity for Improvement:

P1. Over the past year, have you sent out any written communications to districts or other subgrantees about the professional development that [this program] supports?

a.	Yes [Get a copy]	1	
b.	No	2	___

P2. In written communication--or in workshops, monitoring, or other interactions--did you encourage subgrantees to focus on any of the following topics in their professional development? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Content or performance standards	1	___
b.	Student assessment	1	___
c.	Planning and carrying out whole-school improvement	1	___
d.	Specific academic subject(s) (e.g., reading, math)	1	___
e.	Meeting the needs of special populations	1	___
f.	Adopting and implementing particular model programs	1	___
g.	Effective roles for instructional aides	1	___
h.	Techniques for working with families	1	___
i.	Extended instructional time	1	___
j.	Use of data-driven decision making (e.g., student assessments)	1	___
k.	Other(s) (SPECIFY):_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		
l.	No, we did not encourage any particular content focus	1	___

P3. Did any of your written or personal communications encourage subgrantees to use particular approaches in providing professional development? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Professional development that is sustained over more than a single event	1	___
b.	Professional development in which teams of individuals from a particular school participate together	1	___
c.	Initiation of professional development by the school building rather than the school district	1	___
d.	Teacher or administrator networks (electronic and/or face-to-face)	1	___
e.	Use of technology, including electronic networks	1	___
f.	Other(s) (SPECIFY):_____ _____ _____	1	___
g.	No, we did not encourage any particular approaches	1	___

P4. Did any of your written or personal communications encourage subgrantees to pool [this program's] funds for professional development with those of any other federal or state program(s)?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY program[s]):_____ _____ _____	1	
b.	No	2	___

P5. [If responses to P2-P4 indicate that any priorities, approaches, or pooling of funds have been recommended] Does your encouragement for [specify] represent a change from what [this program] has encouraged in the past? [Probe for nature of change]

a.	Yes (SPECIFY)_____ _____ _____	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	
d.	Question skipped; does not apply	4	___

P6. Are there topics or approaches in professional development that [this program] encouraged more actively in the past but has deemphasized? [Probe for nature of change]

a.	Yes (SPECIFY)_____ _____ _____	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	___

P7. [If any change is cited in P5 or P6], What prompted this change? [Probe for influence of state priorities, state funding, federal law or regulations, federal guidance or assistance, federal funding, professional trends, local educators]

P8. What kinds of technical assistance is your office providing to assist subgrantees in program development and operations? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	We distribute written guidance to all districts	1	___
b.	We offer periodic statewide meetings	1	___
c.	We go to districts to provide assistance	1	___
d.	We provide assistance through electronic mail	1	___
e.	We offer assistance through our state's regional service centers	1	___
f.	We make available the names and addresses of consultants and resource centers	1	___
g.	We have developed networks of local staff	1	___
h.	Other (SPECIFY)_____	1	___

_____

_____

P9. In the past year, has your office funded or directly provided technical assistance to subgrantees on any of the following topics: (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Content or performance standards	1	___
b.	Student assessment	1	___
c.	Planning and carrying out whole-school improvement	1	___
d.	Specific academic subject(s) (e.g., reading, math)	1	___
e.	Meeting the needs of special populations	1	___
f.	Adopting and implementing particular model programs	1	___
g.	Effective roles for instructional aides	1	___
h.	Techniques for working with families	1	___
i.	Extended instructional time	1	___
j.	Use of data-driven decision making (e.g., student assessments)	1	___
k.	Other(s) (SPECIFY):_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		
l.	No particular content focus	1	___

P10. Since the reauthorization of ESEA, has there been a change in the focus or procedures for technical assistance? [Probe for specifics]

a. Yes (SPECIFY)_____ . . 1

_____

_____

b. No . . . . . 2 **GO TO P12** ___

P11. What are the priorities for allocating this program's technical assistance resources? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Districts with low achievement	1	___
b.	Districts with less experienced program managers	1	___
c.	Districts that request help	1	___
d.	High-poverty districts	1	___
e.	Districts with program compliance problems	1	___
e.	Other (SPECIFY):_____ . .	1	___

_____

_____

P12. [If a change], What prompted this change? [Probe for influence of state priorities, state funding, federal law or regulations, federal guidance or assistance, federal funding, professional trends, local educators]

Waivers:

W1. Has your office submitted any requests to the U.S. Department of Education for waivers of statutory or regulatory requirements on a statewide basis (as opposed to forwarding a waiver request for a local district)? If so, what issue(s) prompted the waiver request(s)?

a. Yes, the state has requested waiver(s) (SPECIFY ISSUES)_____ . 1

_____

_____

b. No, the state has not requested a waiver . . . . . 2 ___

W2. How many statewide waiver requests, if any, do you expect this office to submit to ED over the next 12 months? _____ ___

100

W3. If a local district submits a request for a waiver of statutory or regulatory requirements under [this program], to what office does that request go in the SEA?

a.	My office	1	
b.	Another office (SPECIFY) _____	2 GO TO A1	___

W4. About how many waiver requests from local districts would you estimate this office will forward to ED over the next 12 months? _____ ___

W5. How has your office informed local districts and schools about the waiver authority in the new law? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	By forwarding copies of the U.S. Department of Education's waiver guidance	1	___
b.	By sending out written information developed by the state (GET A COPY)	1	___
c.	By addressing the subject at statewide or regional meetings	1	___
d.	By providing technical assistance to districts in the process of preparing waiver requests	1	___
e.	By other means (SPECIFY)_____	1	___

W6. Has your office distributed ED's waiver guidance to any of the following state-level offices? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Other offices in the state education agency	1	___
b.	Other state agencies	1	___
c.	State board of education	1	___
d.	State legislative offices	1	___

W7. What kinds of guidance or suggestions, if any, does this office distribute to districts that are considering submitting a waiver request? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Guidance on format	1	___
b.	Guidance on using waivers to improve the quality of instruction	1	___
c.	Guidance on using waivers to help coordinate [this program's] funding with state reform efforts	1	___
d.	Guidance on using waivers to improve student performance	1	___
e.	None	1	___
f.	Not applicable, no districts have said they are considering waiver requests	1 GO TO W11	___

W8. What kind of guidance on reporting has this office provided to districts that have received waivers? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Written guidance (GET A COPY)	1	___
b.	More informal guidance on how to describe the uses of waivers	1	___
c.	More informal guidance on how to describe assistance provided to the populations served by [this program]	1	___
d.	More informal guidance on how to evaluate progress in improving instruction and student performance	1	___
e.	No guidance as yet	1	___

W9. How would you rate the effects of the waiver authority to date on each of the following:

	Considerable	Moderate	Slight	None	Don't Know	
a. Contributions to increasing the quality of instruction	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. Contributions to improving student performance	1	2	3	4	5	___
c. More efficient administration of programs	1	2	3	4	5	___
d. Contributions to addressing the needs of special populations	1	2	3	4	5	___

W10. Do many of the waiver requests from local districts involve a state law or regulation that might need to be changed instead of a federal statutory or regulatory requirement?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY WHICH STATE LAW(S) OR REGULATION(S))_____ _____ _____	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	___

W11. Does the state have plans to review state laws and regulations that may act as barriers to local reform?

a.	Yes (WHEN)_____ _____ _____	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	___

W12. Does the state have authority to waive state law or regulations? If so, is it limited or does it cover all requirements?

a.	Authority to waive some state regulations (SPECIFY)_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		
b.	Authority to waive all state regulations	1	___
c.	Authority to waive some statutory requirements (SPECIFY)_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		
d.	Authority to waive all statutory requirements	1	___
e.	No state-level waiver authority	1	___
f.	Don't know	1	___

Flexibility and Accountability in General:

A1. Is this state using the provision in the new ESEA that allows it to consolidate administrative funding under different programs? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Yes [PRECODE]	1	
b.	No	2 **GO TO A3**	
c.	Don't know	3 **GO TO A3**	___

A2. To what extent has this consolidation of funds affected the way you do your job? How?

a.	To a considerable extent (SPECIFY)_____	1	
	_____		
	_____		
b.	Somewhat (SPECIFY)_____	2	
	_____		
	_____		
c.	Not at all	3	___

A3. Taking into account all of your office's responsibilities under this program, to what extent do you find that this legislation gives you more administrative flexibility than you had before the reauthorization?

a.	To a considerable extent	1	
b.	Somewhat	2	
c.	Not at all	3 **GO TO A6**	
d.	Too early to tell	4 **GO TO A6**	___

A4. Please elaborate on the ways in which your flexibility has increased.

A5. In what ways, if at all, has this flexibility improved the performance of state functions?

A6. For local school districts, schools, or other subgrantees, to what extent do you find that this legislation gives more administrative flexibility than they had before the reauthorization?

a.	To a considerable extent	1	
b.	Somewhat	2	
c.	Not at all	3	___

A7. Please elaborate on the ways in which their flexibility has increased.

A8. What kinds of data on student performance do you now receive or do you expect to receive soon? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Achievement data	1	___
b.	Attendance data	1	___
c.	Data on dropout rates	1	___
d.	Data on other behaviors	1	___
e.	Other (SPECIFY): _____	1	___

_____

_____

A9. Does this office receive (or expect to receive soon) data that track student performance over time?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	___

A10. How has this office used the data that you have received concerning student performance? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Identifying schools for recognition	1	___
b.	Identifying schools that need help	1	___
c.	Sending reports to districts	1	___
d.	Sending reports to technical assistance providers	1	___
e.	Other (SPECIFY): _____	1	___

_____

_____

A11. Does this office receive (or expect to receive soon) data on student performance that are disaggregated or broken down in some way--for example, by schools, by poverty level, or by race?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY how data are broken down) _____	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	___

A12. Does this office receive (or expect to receive soon) data on the performance of just those students participating in [this program]?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	___

A13. Has this office developed program performance indicators?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2 **GO TO O1**	
c.	Don't know	3 **GO TO O1**	___

A14. What factors(s) influenced the development of program performance indicators?

a.	Federal program requirements	1	
b.	State requirements (SPECIFY) _____	2	
c.	Other (SPECIFY) _____	3	___

_____

_____

_____

A15. To what extent will implementing performance indicators help your work?

a.	Great extent	1
b.	Some extent	2
c.	Very little	3
d.	Not helpful	4

___

Overall Successes and Problems:

O1. Taking into account your entire experience with the administration of [this program] since it was reauthorized, what would you say is working well? How do you know this?

O2. What would you say have been the greatest problems in implementation? How do you know this?

O3. In what areas do you think your state has the farthest to go in meeting its own reform goals?

O4. In what ways, if any, do you think the reauthorized [program] reinforces the direction in which your state is moving?

O5. In what areas, if any, is there the greatest mismatch between the new legislation and your state's policies?

O6. Which provisions of the legislation are the most difficult to implement?

O7. Which provisions are the most helpful in meeting the program's goals and/or improving student achievement?

Additional Items for the State Coordinator of Title I, Part A

1. Does your office provide districts with a model format for school performance profiles?

a.	Yes (GET A COPY)	1	
b.	No	2	____

2. What has your office done to inform districts and schools about the provisions for schoolwide programs? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Conducted workshops that discuss schoolwide programs among other topics	1	
b.	Conducted workshops specifically focused on schoolwide programs	2	
c.	Called district officials to suggest they consider schoolwide programs	3	
d.	Sent information by mail or e-mail to district officials	4	
e.	Sent information by mail or e-mail to principals of eligible schools	5	
f.	Other (SPECIFY)_____	6	
	_____		
	_____		
g.	None of the above	7	____

3. Which of the following categories of individuals are included on this state's School Support Teams? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Teachers	1	____
b.	Principals	1	____
c.	Title I coordinators	1	____
d.	Pupil services personnel	1	____
e.	Retired educators	1	____
f.	Faculty of higher education institutions	1	____
g.	Regional educational laboratory or research center staff	1	____
h.	State government employees	1	____
i.	Other (SPECIFY):_____	1	____
	_____		
	_____		
j.	Don't know	1	____

4. What are the main things the School Support Teams have done so far? [Find out about accomplishments to date--or whether they are in early stages of organizing.]

5. What is the process used for school support team work?

6. If your state has developed a measure of adequate yearly progress, do you personally believe it sets the expectations too high, too low, or about right? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Too high	1	
b.	Too low	2	
c.	About right	3	
d.	Don't have a measure yet	4	___

7. Since the new law was passed, has [the state] issued written guidance to school districts regarding the development of local consolidated plans?

a.	Yes (GET A COPY)	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	___

8. Since the new law was passed, has your office issued written guidance to school districts regarding the provision of Title I services to private school students?

a.	Yes (GET A COPY)	1	
b.	No	2	___

9. In what ways, if any, have you actively encouraged districts to apply for capital expense funds? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Provided written advice about the availability of these funds	1	___
b.	Phone calls and other direct communication with districts	1	___
c.	Offers to assist in applying for capital expense funds	1	___
d.	Streamlined application process	1	___
e.	Other (SPECIFY)_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		
f.	Have not actively encouraged applications	1	___

10. Did your state use all of its 1995-96 capital expense funds?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2	___

11. Do you anticipate that your state will use all of its 1996-97 capital expense funds?

a. Yes 1
b. No (Why not?)_____ . . 2 ____

_____

_____

STATE: _____

Program: _____

Respondent's Position/Title: _____

Survey Completion Date: _____

Federal Assistance With Comprehensive Standards-Based Reform

12. To what extent do you feel that the written and oral communications of the U.S. Department of Education have provided a clear and consistent vision of comprehensive standards-based reform? ***NOTE:*** ***Comprehensive standards-based reform is defined as:*** *Efforts to improve education for all students by establishing high content and performance standards and redesigning the various components of the education system - including curriculum, instruction, professional development and assessment - in a coordinated and coherent fashion to support students' learning to the standards.* (CIRCLE ONE.)

a.	Not at all	1
b.	To a small extent	2
c.	Somewhat	3
d.	To a great extent	4
e.	Don't know	0

___

13. Are there particular areas of confusion? Please describe.

14. How helpful have each of the following sources of information been to your progress in comprehensive standards-based reform (that is, to your progress in establishing standards, assessments, curriculum, professional development, etc.) (CIRCLE RESPONSES.)

Source of Information	Not at all Helpful	A Little Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful	No Contact
Written information from U.S. Dept of Ed. (ED) (e.g., guidance, other mailings)	1	2	3	4	0
Oral information from ED (phone or meetings with officials)	1	2	3	4	0
ED sponsored conferences/workshops	1	2	3	4	0
ED on-line services	1	2	3	4	0
1-800-USA-LEARN (ED's toll-free number)	1	2	3	4	0
National model content standards	1	2	3	4	0
Regional Education Labs	1	2	3	4	0
New Federally-supported Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers	1	2	3	4	0
National Science Foundation-funded initiative (e.g., SSI, USI, RSI)	1	2	3	4	0
Subject matter associations (e.g., NCTM, NSTA)	1	2	3	4	0
Other professional associations (e.g., CCSSO)	1	2	3	4	0
Education periodicals/ publications	1	2	3	4	0
Institutions of higher education	1	2	3	4	0
Other States	1	2	3	4	0
Other private non-governmental organizations or foundations	1	2	3	4	0
Other (SPECIFY)_____					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

15. Considering all the information and assistance you have received from various sources on comprehensive standards-based reform, please indicate the extent to which you need additional information or assistance in each of the following areas. (CIRCLE RESPONSES.)

Area	Have Adequate Info or Asst.	Need a Little More Info or Asst.	Need Some More Info or Asst.	Need a Great Deal More Info or Asst.
Establishing high content and performance standards for all students	1	2	3	4
Aligning curricula and instructional materials with standards	1	2	3	4
Developing or adopting assessments linked to standards	1	2	3	4
Linking professional development to standards	1	2	3	4
Linking school/district accountability to student performance	1	2	3	4
Building partnerships with parents and community	1	2	3	4

For ratings '3' and '4' please provide suggestions on how the US Department of Education might help (e.g., do you have preferred ways of receiving information? On-line? Workshops? Printed materials?)

16. The U.S. Department of Education has recently changed its approach to program monitoring. Are you aware of the establishment of Regional Service Teams within the Federal Department of Education to conduct integrated reviews across Federal elementary and secondary education programs?

_____ Yes _____ No

17. Have you been contacted by a member of a Regional Service Team regarding an integrated review of Federal elementary and secondary education programs?

_____ Yes, our state has been visited by a Regional Service Team

_____ Yes, our state has been contacted by a Regional Service Team member

_____ No, our state has had no contact with a Regional Service Team

18. How helpful do you think the Department's strategy for conducting integrated program reviews will be to your state in implementing comprehensive standards-based reform? (CIRCLE ONE)

Not at all Helpful	A Little Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	0

19. Do you have comments or concerns regarding integrated program reviews? Please describe.

Flexibility Provisions

20. The reauthorization of *ESEA* and *Goals 2000* provide for greater flexibility in implementing federal programs. For each of the following flexibility provisions, please rate the extent to which you understand the provision. (CIRCLE RESPONSES.)

Flexibility Provision	No Understanding	Limited Understanding	Reasonable Understanding	Full Understanding
Schoolwide programs through Title I	1	2	3	4
Waivers of federal education provisions	1	2	3	4
Consolidated planning for federal programs	1	2	3	4
Consolidation of federal administrative funds	1	2	3	4
Shift in accountability emphasis from procedural compliance to student performance	1	2	3	4

21. The reauthorization of *ESEA* included changes in accountability mechanisms for Title I. For each provision identified, please rate: the extent to which you understand the accountability provision; and the expected difficulty of implementing it in your state. (CIRCLE RESPONSES.)

	a. Understanding				***b. Actual or Expected Difficulty in Implementing***			
ESEA Provision	No Under-standing	Limited Under-standing	Reasonable Under-standing	Full Under-standing	Not at all Difficult	Minor Difficulties	Moderate Difficulties	Very Difficult
Establishing adequate yearly progress criteria for districts and schools	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Reporting assessment results by student performance levels (advanced, proficient, and partially proficient)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Providing effective technical assistance for districts identified as in need of improvement	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Initiating corrective action against districts identified as in need of improvement	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

22. How helpful have each of the following sources of information been to your understanding of the new flexibility and accountability provisions in federal legislation (e.g., waivers, schoolwide programs)? (CIRCLE RESPONSES.)

Source of Information	Not at all Helpful	A Little Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful	No Contact
Written information from U.S. Dept of Ed. (ED) (e.g., guidance, other mailings)	1	2	3	4	0
Oral information from ED (phone or meetings with officials)	1	2	3	4	0
ED sponsored conferences/workshops	1	2	3	4	0
ED on-line services	1	2	3	4	0
1-800-USA-LEARN	1	2	3	4	0
Regional Education Labs	1	2	3	4	0
New Federally-supported Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers	1	2	3	4	0
Other professional associations (e.g., CCSSO)	1	2	3	4	0
Education periodicals/ publications	1	2	3	4	0
Institutions of higher education	1	2	3	4	0
Other States	1	2	3	4	0
Other private non-governmental organizations or foundations	1	2	3	4	0
Other (SPECIFY)_____					

23. How would you rate the assistance provided by the U.S. Department of Education with regard to waiver requests? (CIRCLE ONE.)

a.	Not helpful	1
b.	A little helpful	2
c.	Helpful	3
d.	Very helpful	4
e.	Not applicable, Haven't requested a waiver	0

For ratings `1' and `2' please provide suggestions on how the U.S. Department of Education efforts might be improved.

24. Considering all the information and assistance you have received from various sources, please indicate the extent to which you need additional information or assistance in each of the following areas. (CIRCLE RESPONSES.)

	Have Adequate Info.	Need a Little More Info/Asst	Need Some More Info/Asst.	Need a Great Deal More Info/Asst.
Schoolwide programs through Title I	1	2	3	4
Waivers of federal education provisions	1	2	3	4
Consolidated planning for federal programs	1	2	3	4
Consolidation of federal administrative funds	1	2	3	4
Shift in accountability emphasis from procedural compliance to student performance	1	2	3	4
Establishing adequate yearly progress criteria for districts and schools	1	2	3	4
Reporting assessment results by student performance levels (advanced, proficient, and partially proficient)	1	2	3	4
Providing effective technical assistance for districts identified as in need of improvement	1	2	3	4
Initiating corrective action against districts identified as in need of improvement	1	2	3	4

For ratings '3' and '4' please provide suggestions on how the US Department of Education might help (e.g., do you have preferred ways of receiving information? On-line? Workshops? Printed materials?)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

25. Overall, rate the timeliness with which you have received the following types of information from the U.S. Department of Education. (CIRCLE RESPONSES.)

	Very Slow	Somewhat Slow	Somewhat Timely	Very Timely	Don't Know / Not Applicable
Goals 2000 Guidance	1	2	3	4	0
ESEA, Title I, Part A Regulations	1	2	3	4	0
ESEA, Title I, Part A Guidance	1	2	3	4	0
Responses to waiver requests	1	2	3	4	0
Responses to requests for information	1	2	3	4	0

Additional Items for the State Even Start Coordinator

1. How many local subgrant awards did this state make over the past 12 months?

_____ ___

2. What was the total number of applications received for subgrant awards?

_____ ___

3. From which of the following sources are data used to determine local need for an Even Start subgrant? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Applicant districts	1	___
b.	Other SEA program offices (SPECIFY)_____	1	___
c.	Other state agencies (SPECIFY)_____	1	___
d.	Other (SPECIFY)_____	1	___

4. For this year, 1996-97, have there been any subgrant awards made that allow a three- to six-month start-up/planning period before full program implementation is required?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2	___

5. Has your program waived the funding contribution requirement (e.g., 10 percent of the total cost of a subgrant project must be covered by the project in year 1, etc.), in whole or in part, for local projects?

a.	Yes (EXPLAIN)_____	1	
b.	No	2 GO TO Q8	___

6. [If program waives funding contribution requirement] Does this represent a change from what your program has done in the past?

a. Yes (EXPLAIN)_____ . . . 1
_____
_____

b. No . . . . . 2 **GO TO Q8** ___

7. What prompted you to make this change? [Probe for influence of state priorities, state funding, federal law or regulations, federal guidance or assistance, federal funding, professional trends, local educators]

8. In written communication--or in workshops, monitoring, or other interactions--what did you do to help districts fulfill their funding contribution requirement?

9. Do any of the following programs provide supplementary funding to local Even Start subgrant projects? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a. Title I . . . . . 1 ___
b. Head Start . . . . . 1 ___
c. Adult Education . . . . . 1 ___
d. Other (SPECIFY)_____ . . . 1 ___
_____
_____
e. No . . . . . 1 **GO TO Q11** ___

10. [If supplementary funding is provided] Does this represent a change from what has been done in the past?

a. Yes (EXPLAIN)_____ . . . 1
_____
_____

b. No . . . . . 2 ___

11. With which of the following programs, agencies, and organizations does your Even Start program collaborate at the local level? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Title I	1	___
b.	Adult Education	1	___
c.	Head Start	1	___
d.	Other programs within the SEA (SPECIFY)_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		
e.	Parents as Teachers/Other parenting education programs	1	___
f.	JOBS	1	___
g.	Literacy organization (Laubach, LVA, etc.)	1	___
h.	Goals 2000	1	___
i.	Other (SPECIFY)_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		

12. In addition to an early childhood education professional and an adult education professional, who are the members of the state review panel that reviews and approves local Even Start program applications? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Representative of parent/child education organization	1	___
b.	Representative of community-based literacy organization	1	___
c.	Member of local board of education	1	___
d.	Representative of business or industry	1	___
e.	Individual involved in Title I (any or all parts) implementation	1	___
f.	Don't have a state review panel	1	___
g.	Other (SPECIFY)_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		

13. In which of the following ways have subgrant applications changed under the reauthorized law? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	The number of applications has increased	1	___
b.	The number of applications has decreased	1	___
c.	The quality of applications has improved (e.g., the applicants propose to provide a wider range of services and activities; more applications are well written; the project goals reflect those of the state Goals 2000 plan and/or state reform initiatives)	1	___
d.	The quality of applications has deteriorated (e.g., more applications are poorly written; few set goals that reflect the state Goals 2000 plan or other state reform initiatives)	1	___
e.	Other (SPECIFY)_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		
f.	No changes	1 GO TO Q15	___

14. To what do you attribute these changes in subgrant applications?

15. How does the state measure success in Even Start local programs? [Find out about formal and/or informal evidence that the coordinator relies on.]

Additional Items for the State Director of Migrant Education

1. In your opinion, do the state's plans for assessing student mastery of state content standards address migratory students' unique needs?

   a. Yes (EXPLAIN)_____ . . . 1
   _____
   _____

   b. No (EXPLAIN)_____ . . 2
   _____
   _____

   c. Don't know . . . . . 3 GO TO Q3 ___

2. Which of the following migratory student assessment issues are addressed in the state plan? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

   a. Coordination between states to share assessment instruments . . . . . 1 ___
   b. Appointment of state-level personnel to track students moving across state and district boundaries with respect to their assessment records . . . . . 1 ___
   c. School-entry and exit assessments that measure students' mastery of content standards, language proficiency, and grade level or special program placement . . . . . 1 ___
   d. Providing for the inclusion of limited English proficient students . . . . . 1 ___

3. How has your state provided for assessments of students with limited English proficiency? What accommodations do these assessments make for students with limited English proficiency?

4. To what extent is the curriculum used in migrant summer programs aligned with the standards of your state? (CIRCLE ONE)

   a. Not at all 1
   b. A little 2
   c. To some extent 3
   d. To a great extent 4
   e. Don't know . . . . . 5 ___

5. To what extent is the curriculum used in migrant summer programs aligned with the standards of home-base states?

a.	Not at all	1
b.	A little	2
c.	To some extent	3
d.	To a great extent	4
e.	Don't know	5

___

6. How are academic and other records for migrant students who reside in your state being transferred when the students move across school district lines within the state?

Between states?

7. What changes, if any, has your state made in its identification and recruitment procedures in light of the new targeting provisions that limit eligibility to children who have made a qualifying move in the past 36 (as opposed to 72) months?

8. How, if at all, have the services provided to migrant children in your state changed in light of changes in the new law affecting eligibility for migrant education?

9. Are you or another staff member from the migrant program participating in the review/approval of schoolwide programs?

a.	Yes	1
b.	No	2

___

10. Has your office received any inquiries regarding ways to serve the needs of migrant children participating in schoolwide programs?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY)_____	1	
	_____		
	_____		
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	___

Additional Items for State Title VI Coordinator

1. In adjusting your formula for children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child, which of the following factors do you use? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Children living in areas with high concentrations of low-income families	1	___
b.	Children from low-income families	1	___
c.	Sparsely populated areas	1	___
d.	Other (SPECIFY)_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		
e.	No adjustment made	1	___

2. What data source(s) do you use when you adjust your formula?

3. Could you describe how your procedures and priorities for funding under Title VI differ from those used in previous years under Chapter 2?

4. [If any differences are cited], What were the reasons for making that change? [Probe for influence of state priorities, state funding, federal law or regulations, federal guidance or assistance, federal funding, nongovernmental organizations, local educators]

Additional Items for the State Coordinator of Education for Homeless Children and Youth

1. How many local subgrant awards did this state make over the past 12 months?

_____ ____

2. What was the total number of applications received for subgrant awards?

_____ ____

3. For this year, 1996-97, what is the total number of subgrants in operation in this state (i.e., including subgrants that began in previous years)? _____ ____

4. From which of the following sources are data used to determine local need for subgrants? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Applicant districts	1	____
b.	Other SEA program offices (SPECIFY)_____ . . .	1	____
c.	Other state agencies (SPECIFY)_____ . . .	1	____
d.	Other (SPECIFY)_____ . . .	1	____

5. Does your office provide districts with guidance for identifying and selecting homeless children and youth in need of McKinney-funded services (e.g., does your office cite other programs'/ agencies' needs identification systems as potential resources for local districts)?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY)_____ . .	1	
b.	No	2	____

6. Aside from McKinney Act grant monies, does your state agency use funds from other sources to provide services to homeless children and youth?

a. Yes (SPECIFY FUNDING SOURCE AND DOLLAR AMOUNT)
_____ . . 1
_____
_____

b. No . . . . . 2 **GO TO Q9**

c. Don't know . . . . . 3 **GO TO Q9** ___

7. [If agency does use funds from other sources] Does this represent a change from what your program has done in the past?

a. Yes (EXPLAIN)_____ . . . 1
_____
_____

b. No . . . . . 2 **GO TO Q9** ___

8. What prompted you to make this change? [Probe for influence of state priorities, state funding, federal law or regulations, federal guidance or assistance, federal funding, professional trends, local educators]

9. In written communication to districts--or in workshops, monitoring, or other interactions--which among the following did you define to be the two most important roles of a local homeless liaison? (CIRCLE TWO RESPONSES ONLY)

a. To facilitate coordination of services between the school district and the Office of the Coordinator . . . . . 1 ___

b. To coordinate services for homeless children and youth with homeless service providers . . . . . 1 ___

c. To promote awareness among district administrators and teachers of the educational needs of homeless children and youth . . . . . 1 ___

d. To resolve disputes about the educational placement of homeless students . . . . . 1 ___

e. To ensure that homeless children and youth gain access to other programs' services . . . . . 1 ___

f. Other (SPECIFY)_____ . . . 1 ___
_____
_____

g. None of the above; do not define the role of the liaison for districts . . . . . 1 ___

10. Among the following, who reviews local McKinney subgrant applications? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Office of the Coordinator staff	1	___
b.	Other SEA program staff (SPECIFY WHICH PROGRAMS) _____ _____ _____	1	___
c.	Representative of state Department of Health and Human Services	1	___
d.	Representative of state Department of Housing	1	___
e.	Representative of a community-based organization	1	___
f.	Shelter providers	1	___
g.	Other (SPECIFY)_____ _____ _____	1	___

11. In which of the following ways have subgrant applications changed under the reauthorized law? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	The number of applications has increased	1	___
b.	The number of applications has decreased	1	___
c.	The quality of applications has improved (e.g., the applicants propose to provide a wider range of services and activities; more applications are well written; the project goals reflect those of the state Goals 2000 plan and/or state reform initiatives)	1	___
d.	The quality of applications has deteriorated (e.g., more applications are poorly written; few set goals that reflect the state Goals 2000 plan or other state reform initiatives)	1	___
e.	Other (SPECIFY)_____ _____ _____	1	___
f.	No changes	1	___

12. To what do you attribute these changes in subgrant applications?

SELF-CONTAINED SURVEY FOR GOALS 2000 COORDINATOR

Standards and Assessment:

S1. [Where content and performance standards have been/are being developed]: Have you personally participated in the development or review of the state's content and student performance standards (e.g., attended meetings, reviewed draft standards, etc.)?

a. Yes 1
b. No . . . . . 2 ___

S2. Have Goals 2000 funds helped support the development or review of the state's content and student performance standards?

a. Yes 1
b. No 2
c. Don't know . . . . . 3 ___

S3. [Where new assessments have been/are being developed or adopted]: Have Goals 2000 funds helped support the development or review of new assessments?

a. Yes (EXPLAIN)_____ . . 1
_____
_____
b. No 2
c. Don't know . . . . . 3 ___

State Plans:

F1. Have you submitted your state plan for review to the U.S. Department of Education?

a. Yes 1
b. No . . . . . 2 **GO TO F5** ___

F2. Did you find the recommendations provided by the peer review team to be helpful?

a. Very helpful 1
b. Moderately helpful 2
c. Slightly helpful 3
d. Not helpful . . . . . 4 ___

GOALS2K/_____(State)

F3. What actions, if any, has this office taken on recommendations provided by the peer review team?

F4. How could the peer review process be improved?

F5. Please describe the broad-based support received during development and implementation of the state plan.

F6. Has the state improvement plan panel divided itself into subgroups?

a. Yes 1
b. No . . . . . 2 GO TO L1 ___

F7. If so, on what topics do the subgroups focus?

F8. Did you participate in the development of your state's consolidated ESEA plan in 1996?

a. Yes 1
b. No . . . . . 2 ___

Subgrant Applications:

L1. Does your state's Goals 2000 process require or accept consolidated applications (that is, combined applications for more than one program) from districts? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Consolidated applications are required	1	
b.	Consolidated applications are accepted but not required	2	GO TO M1
c.	No, Goals 2000 requires a separate application	3	GO TO M1
d.	Other (SPECIFY) _____	4	___

L2. Are application workshops for subgrantees conducted jointly for Goals 2000 and other programs? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Yes (SPECIFY PROGRAMS) _____	1	
b.	No, application workshops are not conducted for Goals 2000	2	
c.	No, application workshops focus only on Goals 2000	3	
d.	Other (SPECIFY) _____	4	___

Project Monitoring:

M1. In the past 12 months, about what proportion of the Goals 2000 subgrantees received monitoring visits?

a.	Half or more	1	
b.	Between one-fourth and one-half	2	
c.	Fewer than one-fourth	3	
d.	None	4	GO TO M5 ___

M2. On what basis is it decided which subgrantees to visit? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a. There is a routine cycle for visits . . . . . 1 ___
b. Visits are triggered by information suggesting that the grantee is having trouble meeting program requirements. (SPECIFY type and source of information):_____ . . 1 ___
_____
_____
c. Visits are triggered by information about student performance. (SPECIFY type and source of information):_____ . . 1 ___
_____
_____
d. Other (SPECIFY) _____ . 1 ___
_____
_____

M3. Has this state conducted any integrated monitoring visits that address Goals 2000 and also other federal or state programs?

a. Yes (SPECIFY other program[s])_____ . . 1
_____
_____
b. No . . . . . 2 ___

M4. Which of the following program services associated with monitoring does your office provide? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a. Hiring staff who are experienced technical assistance providers . . . . . 1 ___
b. Providing professional development for program monitors [Duration of professional development: # of hours _____] . . . . . 1 [__] ___
c. Sending local subgrant projects questionnaires inquiring about their technical assistance needs . . . . . 1 ___
d. Sending local subgrant projects advance information about the monitoring process . . . . . 1 ___
e. Providing written feedback to local subgrant projects after the visit (GET A COPY OF THE FORMAT) . . . . . 1 ___
f. Conducting follow-up visits (WHEN? e.g., how many months after initial visit) _____ . . 1 [__] ___
g. Other (SPECIFY) _____ . 1 ___
_____
_____

M5. Does the state have plans to review state laws and regulations that may act as barriers to local reform?

a. Yes (WHEN)_____ . . 1
b. No 2
c. Don't know . . . . . 3 [__] ___

M6. Does the state have authority to waive state law or regulations? If so, is it limited or does it cover all requirements?

a.	Authority to waive some state regulations (SPECIFY)_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		
b.	Authority to waive all state regulations	1	___
c.	Authority to waive some statutory requirements (SPECIFY)_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		
d.	Authority to waive all statutory requirements	1	___
e.	No state-level waiver authority	1	___
f.	Don't know	1	___

M7. What kinds of data on student performance do you now receive or do you expect to receive soon? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Achievement data	1	___
b.	Attendance data	1	___
c.	Data on dropout rates	1	___
d.	Data on other behaviors	1	___
e.	Other (SPECIFY):_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		

M8. Does this office receive (or expect to receive soon) data that track student performance over time?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	___

M9. Does this office receive (or expect to receive soon) data on student performance that are disaggregated or broken down in some way--for example, by schools, by poverty level, or by race?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY how data are broken down)_____	1	
	_____		
	_____		
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	___

M10. How has this office used the data that you have received concerning student performance? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Identifying schools for recognition	1	___
b.	Identifying schools that need help	1	___
c.	Sending reports to districts	1	___
d.	Sending reports to technical assistance providers	1	___
e.	Other (SPECIFY):_____	1	___

_____

_____

M11. Has this office developed program performance indicators?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2 **GO TO P1**	
c.	Don't know	3 **GO TO P1**	___

M12. What factors(s) influenced the development of program performance indicators?

a.	Federal program requirements	1	
b.	State requirements (SPECIFY) _____	2	
c.	Other (SPECIFY) _____	3	___

_____

_____

_____

_____

M13. To what extent will implementing performance indicators help your work?

a.	Great extent	1	
b.	Some extent	2	
c.	Very little	3	
d.	Not helpful	4	___

Building Capacity for Improvement:

P1. Over the past year, have you sent out any written communications to districts about the professional development that Goals 2000 supports?

a.	Yes (GET A COPY)	1	
b.	No	2	___

P2. In written communication--or in workshops, monitoring, or other interactions--did you encourage districts to focus on any of the following topics in their professional development? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Content or performance standards	1	___
b.	Student assessment	1	___
c.	Planning and carrying out whole-school improvement	1	___
d.	Specific academic subject(s) (e.g., reading, math)	1	___
e.	Meeting the needs of special populations	1	___
f.	Adopting and implementing particular model programs	1	___
g.	Effective roles for instructional aides	1	___
h.	Techniques for working with families	1	___
i.	Extended instructional time	1	___
j.	Use of data-driven decision making (e.g., student assessments)	1	___
k.	Other(s) (SPECIFY):_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		
l.	No, we did not encourage any particular content focus	1	___

P3. Did any of your written or personal communications encourage districts to use particular approaches in providing professional development? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Professional development that is sustained over more than a single event	1	___
b.	Professional development in which teams of individuals from a particular school participate together	1	___
c.	Initiation of professional development by the school building rather than the school district	1	___
d.	Teacher or administrator networks (electronic and/or face-to-face)	1	___
e.	Use of technology, including electronic networks	1	___
f.	Other(s) (SPECIFY):_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		
g.	No, we did not encourage any particular approaches	1	___

P4. Did any of your written or personal communications encourage districts to pool Goals 2000 funds for professional development with those of any other federal or state program(s)?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY program[s]):_____	1	
	_____		
	_____		
b.	No	2	___

P5. What kinds of technical assistance is your office providing to assist districts in program development and operations? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	We distribute written guidance to all districts	1	____
b.	We offer periodic statewide meetings	1	____
c.	We go to districts to provide assistance	1	____
d.	We provide assistance through electronic mail	1	____
e.	We offer assistance through our state's regional service centers	1	____
f.	We make available the names and addresses of consultants and resource centers	1	____
g.	We have developed networks of local staff	1	____
h.	Other (SPECIFY)_____	1	____

_____

_____

P6. In the past year, has Goals 2000 funded or directly provided technical assistance to districts or schools on any of the following topics: (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Content or performance standards	1	____
b.	Student assessment	1	____
c.	Planning and carrying out whole-school improvement	1	____
d.	Specific academic subject(s) (e.g., reading, math)	1	____
e.	Meeting the needs of special populations	1	____
f.	Adopting and implementing particular model programs	1	____
g.	Effective roles for instructional aides	1	____
h.	Techniques for working with families	1	____
i.	Extended instructional time	1	____
j.	Use of data-driven decision making (e.g., student assessments)	1	____
k.	Other(s) (SPECIFY):_____	1	____

_____

_____

l.	No particular content focus	1	____

P7. What are the priorities for allocating this program's technical assistance resources? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Districts with low achievement	1	____
b.	Districts with less experienced program managers	1	____
c.	Districts that request help	1	____
d.	High-poverty districts	1	____
e.	Other (SPECIFY):_____	1	____

_____

_____

Targeting:

T1. How many Goals 2000 subgrant awards did this state make over the past 12 months?

_____ ___

T2. What was the total number of applications received for subgrant awards?

_____ ___

T3. On what basis do districts award the 50 percent of funds that are to be made available to schools "with a special need for such assistance"? (CIRCLE ONE)

a.	Primarily poverty	1	
b.	Primarily low achievement	2	
c.	Primarily another basis (SPECIFY)_____	3	
	_____		
	_____		
d.	Don't know	4	___

T4. If the state allocation decreases, do you decrease the size of subgrants or the number of subgrants?

a.	Decrease the size	1	
b.	Decrease the number	2	___

Overall Successes and Problems:

O1. Taking into account your entire experience with the administration of Goals 2000, what would you say is working well? How do you know this?

O2. What would you say have been the greatest problems in implementation? How do you know this?

O3. In what areas do you think your state has the farthest to go in meeting its own reform goals?

O4. In what ways, if any, do you think Goals 2000 reinforces the direction in which your state is moving?

O5. In what areas, if any, is there the greatest mismatch between the Goals 2000 legislation and your state's policies?

O6. Which provisions of the legislation are the most difficult to implement?

O7. Which provisions are the most helpful in meeting the program's goals and/or improving student achievement?

STATE: _____

Program: _____

Respondent's Position/Title: _____

Survey Completion Date: _____

Federal Assistance With Comprehensive Standards-Based Reform

1. To what extent do you feel that the written and oral communications of the U.S. Department of Education have provided a clear and consistent vision of comprehensive standards-based reform? ***NOTE:*** ***Comprehensive standards-based reform is defined as:*** ***Efforts to improve education for all students by establishing high content and performance standards and redesigning the various components of the education system - including curriculum, instruction, professional development and assessment - in a coordinated and coherent fashion to support students' learning to the standards.*** (CIRCLE ONE.)

a.	Not at all	1	
b.	To a small extent	2	
c.	Somewhat	3	
d.	To a great extent	4	
e.	Don't know	0	___

2. Are there particular areas of confusion? Please describe.

3. How helpful have each of the following sources of information been to your progress in comprehensive standards-based reform (that is, to your progress in establishing standards, assessments, curriculum, professional development, etc.) (CIRCLE RESPONSES.)

Source of Information	Not at all Helpful	A Little Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful	No Contact
Written information from U.S. Dept of Ed. (ED) (e.g., guidance, other mailings)	1	2	3	4	0
Oral information from ED (phone or meetings with officials)	1	2	3	4	0
ED sponsored conferences/workshops	1	2	3	4	0
ED on-line services	1	2	3	4	0
1-800-USA-LEARN (ED's toll-free number)	1	2	3	4	0
National model content standards	1	2	3	4	0
Regional Education Labs	1	2	3	4	0
New Federally-supported Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers	1	2	3	4	0
National Science Foundation-funded initiative (e.g., SSI, USI, RSI)	1	2	3	4	0
Subject matter associations (e.g., NCTM, NSTA)	1	2	3	4	0
Other professional associations (e.g., CCSSO)	1	2	3	4	0
Education periodicals/ publications	1	2	3	4	0
Institutions of higher education	1	2	3	4	0
Other States	1	2	3	4	0
Other private non-governmental organizations or foundations	1	2	3	4	0
Other (SPECIFY)_____					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. Considering all the information and assistance you have received from various sources on comprehensive standards-based reform, please indicate the extent to which you need additional information or assistance in each of the following areas. (CIRCLE RESPONSES.)

Area	Have Adequate Info or Asst.	Need a Little More Info or Asst.	Need Some More Info or Asst.	Need a Great Deal More Info or Asst.
Establishing high content and performance standards for all students	1	2	3	4
Aligning curricula and instructional materials with standards	1	2	3	4
Developing or adopting assessments linked to standards	1	2	3	4
Linking professional development to standards	1	2	3	4
Linking school/district accountability to student performance	1	2	3	4
Building partnerships with parents and community	1	2	3	4

For ratings '3' and '4' please provide suggestions on how the US Department of Education might help (e.g., do you have preferred ways of receiving information? On-line? Workshops? Printed materials?)

5. The U.S. Department of Education has recently changed its approach to program monitoring. Are you aware of the establishment of Regional Service Teams within the Federal Department of Education to conduct integrated reviews across Federal elementary and secondary education programs?

_____ Yes _____ No

6. Have you been contacted by a member of a Regional Service Team regarding an integrated review of Federal elementary and secondary education programs?

_____ Yes, our state has been visited by a Regional Service Team

_____ Yes, our state has been contacted by a Regional Service Team member

_____ No, our state has had no contact with a Regional Service Team

7. How helpful do you think the Department's strategy for conducting integrated program reviews will be to your state in implementing comprehensive standards-based reform? (CIRCLE ONE)

Not at all Helpful	A Little Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	0

8. Do you have comments or concerns regarding integrated program reviews? Please describe.

Flexibility Provisions

9. The reauthorization of *ESEA* and *Goals 2000* provide for greater flexibility in implementing federal programs. For each of the following flexibility provisions, please rate the extent to which you understand the provision. (CIRCLE RESPONSES.)

Flexibility Provision	No Understanding	Limited Understanding	Reasonable Understanding	Full Understanding
Schoolwide programs through Title I	1	2	3	4
Waivers of federal education provisions	1	2	3	4
Consolidated planning for federal programs	1	2	3	4
Consolidation of federal administrative funds	1	2	3	4
Shift in accountability emphasis from procedural compliance to student performance	1	2	3	4

10. How helpful have each of the following sources of information been to your understanding of the new flexibility and accountability provisions in federal legislation (e.g., waivers, schoolwide programs)? (CIRCLE RESPONSES.)

Source of Information	Not at all Helpful	A Little Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful	No Contact
Written information from U.S. Dept of Ed. (ED) (e.g., guidance, other mailings)	1	2	3	4	0
Oral information from ED (phone or meetings with officials)	1	2	3	4	0
ED sponsored conferences/workshops	1	2	3	4	0
ED on-line services	1	2	3	4	0
1-800-USA-LEARN	1	2	3	4	0
Regional Education Labs	1	2	3	4	0
New Federally-supported Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers	1	2	3	4	0
Other professional associations (e.g., CCSSO)	1	2	3	4	0
Education periodicals/ publications	1	2	3	4	0
Institutions of higher education	1	2	3	4	0
Other States	1	2	3	4	0
Other private non-governmental organizations or foundations	1	2	3	4	0
Other (SPECIFY)_____					

11. How would you rate the assistance provided by the U.S. Department of Education with regard to waiver requests? (CIRCLE ONE.)

a. Not helpful 1
b. A little helpful 2
c. Helpful 3
d. Very helpful 4
e. Not applicable, Haven't requested a waiver . . . . . 0 ___

For ratings '1' and '2' please provide suggestions on how the U.S. Department of Education efforts might be improved.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

12. Considering all the information and assistance you have received from various sources, please indicate the extent to which you need additional information or assistance in each of the following areas. (CIRCLE RESPONSES.)

	Have Adequate Info.	Need a Little More Info/Asst	Need Some More Info/Asst.	Need a Great Deal More Info/Asst.
Schoolwide programs through Title I	1	2	3	4
Waivers of federal education provisions	1	2	3	4
Consolidated planning for federal programs	1	2	3	4
Consolidation of federal administrative funds	1	2	3	4
Shift in accountability emphasis from procedural compliance to student performance	1	2	3	4
Establishing adequate yearly progress criteria for districts and schools	1	2	3	4
Reporting assessment results by student performance levels (advanced, proficient, and partially proficient)	1	2	3	4
Providing effective technical assistance for districts identified as in need of improvement	1	2	3	4
Initiating corrective action against districts identified as in need of improvement	1	2	3	4

For ratings '3' and '4' please provide suggestions on how the US Department of Education might help (e.g., do you have preferred ways of receiving information? On-line? Workshops? Printed materials?)

13. Overall, rate the timeliness with which you have received the following types of information from the U.S. Department of Education. (CIRCLE RESPONSES.)

	Very Slow	Somewhat Slow	Somewhat Timely	Very Timely	Don't Know / Not Applicable
Goals 2000 Guidance	1	2	3	4	0
ESEA, Title I, Part A Regulations	1	2	3	4	0
ESEA, Title I, Part A Guidance	1	2	3	4	0
Responses to waiver requests	1	2	3	4	0
Responses to requests for information	1	2	3	4	0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Self-Contained Survey for Title I Assessment Expert

1. Have you personally participated in the development or review of the state's content and performance standards?

   a. Yes 1
   b. No . . . . . 2 ___

2. As far as you know, have Title I funds helped support the development or review of the state's content and performance standards?

   a. Yes 1
   b. No 2
   c. Don't know . . . . . 3 ___

3. In what school years would you anticipate that this state will conduct field testing and full implementation of....

	School Year for Field Testing	School Year for Full Implementation
a. Assessments aligned with content standards		
b. Establishment of student performance levels		
c. Disaggregated reporting procedures (e.g., by school, student race/ethnicity, etc.)		
d. Assessments suitable for LEP students		

4. For this year, 1996-97, what types of yearly student assessments are used in this state in reading or language arts? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

   a. A norm-referenced test from a test publisher . . . . . 1 ___
   b. A criterion-referenced test from a test publisher . . . . . 1 ___
   c. A customized state assessment . . . . . 1 ___
   d. A customized state assessment aligned with content standards . . . . . 1 ___
   e. An assessment adopted or adapted from New Standards . . . . . 1 ___
   f. Other (SPECIFY):_____ . . 1 ___
   _____
   _____

5. In what grades are yearly student assessments in reading/language arts conducted in 1996-97?

_____ ___

6. For this year, 1996-97, what types of yearly student assessments are used in this state in mathematics? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	A norm-referenced test from a test publisher	1	___
b.	A criterion-referenced test from a test publisher	1	___
c.	A customized state assessment	1	___
d.	A customized state assessment aligned with content standards	1	___
e.	An assessment adopted or adapted from New Standards	1	___
f.	Other (SPECIFY):_____	1	___

_____

_____

7. In what grades are yearly student assessments in mathematics conducted in 1996-97?

_____ ___

8. For this year, 1996-97, is this state measuring yearly student progress in any subject(s) other than reading/language arts and mathematics?

a.	Yes (SPECIFY subjects):_____	1	
b.	No	2 GO TO Q11	___

_____

_____

9. What types of yearly student assessments are used in other subject(s)? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	A norm-referenced test from a test publisher	1	___
b.	A criterion-referenced test from a test publisher	1	___
c.	A customized,state assessment	1	___
d.	A customized state assessment aligned with content standards	1	___
e.	An assessment adopted or adapted from New Standards	1	___
f.	Other (SPECIFY):_____	1	___

_____

_____

10. In what grades is this state conducting yearly student assessments in other subject(s)?

_____ ___

11. In any academic subject, which of the following types of test items do students complete as part of the 1996-97 school year's assessment? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Multiple-choice response formats	1	___
b.	Short-answer response formats	1	___
c.	Composition of paragraphs	1	___
d.	Composition of longer essays	1	___
e.	Group problem solving	1	___
f.	Projects requiring more than one class period to complete	1	___
g.	Portfolios	1	___
h.	Other (SPECIFY):_____	1	___

_____

_____

12. What types of performance reports are routinely distributed by schools, districts, or the state? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Individual summary scores	1	___
b.	More detailed profiles of individual performance	1	___
c.	School-level summary scores	1	___
d.	District-level summary scores	1	___
e.	Program summary scores	1	___
f.	Data disaggregated by category (SPECIFY CATEGORIES):		
	_____	1	___

_____

_____

13. Are there any students who do not participate in the assessments? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Students who are not served by Title I do not participate	1	___
b.	Students with limited English proficiency do not participate (How many?_____)	1	|__|__
c.	Students with disabilities do not participate (How many?_____)	1	|__|__
d.	No exclusions; every student in the state at the selected grade levels participates	1	___

14. For this year, 1996-97, is this state using transitional assessments for Title I?

a.	Yes (DESCRIBE)_____	1	

_____

_____

b.	No	2 GO TO Q18	___

15. [If state used transitional assessments], Could you describe how the tests and procedures for transitional assessment differ, if at all, from those that were previously used under Chapter 1?

16. [If any differences are cited], What were the reasons for making that change? [Probe for influence of state priorities, state funding, federal law or regulations, federal guidance or assistance, federal funding, nongovernmental organizations, local educators]

17. [If using transitional assessment], How do you anticipate that future assessment will differ from the current transitional assessments?

18. Has this state developed a measure of adequate yearly progress?

a. Yes (DESCRIBE; GET COPY OF ANY WRITTEN INFORMATION)_____ . . 1

_____

_____

b. No . . . . . 2 ____

19. In identifying schools for Title I school improvement, which of the following types of indicators does the state require or strongly encourage districts to use? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

a.	Scores on nationally standardized tests	1	___
b.	NCEs	1	___
c.	Scores on state-developed assessments	1	___
d.	New Standards data	1	___
e.	Dropout data	1	___
f.	Other (SPECIFY):_____	1	___
	_____		
	_____		
g.	No requirements; districts choose any indicators they want	1	___

20. Do the indicators being used differ from those that were used under Chapter 1?

a.	Yes (EXPLAIN)_____	1	
	_____		
	_____		
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	___

21. [If any differences are cited], What were the reasons for that change? [Probe for influence of state priorities, state funding, federal law or regulations, federal guidance or assistance, federal funding, nongovernmental organizations, local educators]

22. Outside of Title I school improvement, does this state have its own procedures for identifying failing schools and correcting their problems?

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2 GO TO Q24	___

23. Are the indicators and procedures used for identifying schools for Title I school improvement largely the same as the indicators and procedures used for the state process? [Get a description and explanation of differences]

a.	Yes	1	
b.	No	2	
c.	Don't know	3	___

24. In following the Title I requirements for assessment, what requirements, if any, are difficult for you to understand or to carry out?

25. What questions are you receiving most often from districts as they carry out the Title I requirements for assessment?

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE:1998-716-343/93545